



"A reformed Parliament puts an end to BURDETT; his shuffling upon a motion to sweep the pension and sinecure-list clean off the paper; his shuffling upon a motion for tearing the leaves out of the accursed 'Red Book;' either of these will finish him. Oh, my God! how he dreads reform! Never did shirking, straight-backed Scotch 'feelofer' so dread a spade, as this crafty, shuffling jade of a patriot dreads parliamentary reform."—*Register*, 24. December, 1831.

### MR. COBBETT'S ADDRESS TO THE ELECTORS OF THE

### WESTERN DIVISION OF THE COUNTY OF SURREY.

Normandy, Ash, 1. December, 1832.

MY FRIENDS,

As an Englishman, merely as a subject of the same king, I have a right to address you upon the subject of the ensuing election. Understanding more about such matters than the far greater part of my fellow-subjects can possibly understand, it is also my duty respectfully to tender to any part of them my opinions upon a matter which so deeply interests us all, and upon our conduct relative to which may finally depend the peace and happiness of our country. To YOU I owe a particular duty in this case. You occupy the spot upon which I myself was born and reared up, to mankind; and I am, also, now your neighbour upon that spot. All these circumstances united make it my duty to lay before you my opinions with regard to the choice which we ought to make of two members to represent us in the first reformed Parliament. It would have been my duty to do this some months back; but I could not

attend to the affairs of this county, without neglecting those other affairs which, for that time, appeared to me to be more important. I shall not have an opportunity of meeting you and of addressing you in person, before the election will have taken place; and therefore, I do it in this manner, deeming it criminal in me to omit to cause you to see what will probably be the effects of your making an improper choice at this nearly-approaching election.

The candidates are Messrs. LEECH, DENISON, and SUMNER; the two former being looked upon as ready to do their best for the people, as ready to make that *great and absolutely necessary change* which we are all wishing for and expecting; and the latter being deemed to be a man *resolved upon making no change at all*, but upon causing us to be *taxed and tithed* and pressed down to the earth, in the same manner that we have been for so many years past. Now, my friends, with regard to Mr. Sumner, I believe that this is his full intention; I believe that he will act thus; and I believe it, because he always has acted thus, and because he has never said that he would act otherwise, and has always plainly told us that he would not. So that, to choose him, to vote for him, is, in fact, to vote against any alteration at all of the system under which we groan.

But with regard to the other two gentlemen, there is something to say which is very well worthy of your attention. It seems to be taken for granted, that they will endeavour to make *the great change* which we want to have made. Now, it is of vast importance that we be not *deceived* in this respect. With regard to Mr. LEECH, I have not seen that gentleman for about twenty years past; I have not had any communication with him, either verbal or written, directly or indirectly; but I know, from all the conduct of his past life, that he is *safely to be trusted*, and that he will do to the utmost of his power, every thing *to relieve us from*

*our burdens*; for all the rest is nonsense; it is these oppressive burdens which we want to have taken from our backs; and I am quite satisfied that Mr. Leech will do his best to take these burdens from those backs.

But with regard to Mr. Denison, very different is my opinion. What do we want to have done? For what did we so labour to obtain this reform? Why have we so boasted of our triumph in having obtained it? Because we thought it would make us *better off* than we now are. *How* was it to do that? Why, by causing the burdens; that is to say, the taxes, to be taken from our overloaded shoulders. The several sorts of taxes press, one more heavily upon one class of persons; another more heavily upon another class of persons; the house and window-tax, particularly heavy on the merchants and traders; the corn-tax more heavily upon the manufacturers; the tithe-tax and the malt, hop, and soap-tax, more particularly heavy on those who cultivate the land. Now, it is our duty in this case, to look after our own affairs, and to take care that we be relieved, while the merchants and traders are justly and sensibly taking care that they will be relieved. Let me now, therefore, my friends, beg your attention to what I have to say about these *burdens upon the land*, seeing that ours is a purely agricultural spot. I shall first speak of the *TITHES*; and then I shall speak of the monstrously oppressive taxes on *our malt*, on *our hops*, and *our soap*; the last being a tax laid upon our *ashes* and upon the *loose fat* that comes from our animals: when I have spoken of these, I will give you my opinion as to what will be the conduct of Mr. Denison with regard to them; and then you will judge whether you ought to give him a vote on any condition whatsoever, and especially whether you ought to give him a vote to the exclusion of Mr. Leech. I have first to beg your attention to the important subject of *TITHES*.

Tithes were instituted in the first place by *MOSES*, afterwards by the *APOSTLES* (who collected them under the name of oblations or offerings) for

the sole purpose of giving relief to the poor, the *unfortunate*, the *widow*, the *orphan*, the *aged*, and the *stranger*. As Christianity extended itself over the civilized world, this provision for the necessitous became general and permanent in every Christian land; Christianity having for its very foundation, *brotherly love and the relief of our poorer neighbour*. Tithes became, in process of time, a general thing, founded on explicit law; but always, in all cases and in every case, their end, their object, the purpose of their institution was solely that of providing relief for the necessitous of the various descriptions before mentioned. Such was the nature of their institution in England; and such was the purpose to which they were applied, for more than *nine hundred years*, out of the twelve hundred since St. AUSTIN first brought the glad tidings of the gospel into the county of Kent. But, at what is called the "*PROTESTANT REFORMATION*," the king, the nobility, and the gentry, seized upon all the tithes and all the church-lands, divided them amongst themselves, or allotted them to be eaten up by bishops and by parsons, and *left the people no means of relief at all*. Just the same took place in Ireland and in Scotland. The unhappy people of those countries were compelled to submit to hunger and nakedness; but the English people, more accustomed to understand the laws and the usages of their forefathers, and more in the habit of asserting their rights, would not so submit; and they compelled the tyrant Queen ELIZABETH and the greedy nobility and gentry of that day, to pass the *POOR-LAW*; that is to say, to make a provision for the poor, the widow, and the orphan, and the stranger, as a *compensation* for what they had been robbed of by the seizure of the tithes and of the church-lands. Never until this time did England hear of *poor-rates* or of *church-rates*: the poor were maintained by the clergy out of the tithes, and the churches were repaired out of the same source. The people said, "We will have relief; we will have something in *compensation* for the loss of our patrimony." And



that savage Queen and her unjust nobility, instead of giving back the patrimony and estate of the people, which they had seized on, kept the tithes and church-lands to themselves, and laid a general tax upon all the people, in order to secure relief for the poor. So that all our lands, all our houses, all our little gardens, all our mills, are now *carrying a double load*; they are paying *tithes to the aristocracy and their dependants, the parsons*, and they are paying *poor-rates for the relief of the poor*.

Now, my friends, justice demands that one or the other of these burdens be taken from the lands and the houses of the kingdom. And, as it would be extremely difficult, and productive of great confusion, to go back to the custom of our fathers, and to cause relief to be given to the poor out of the tithes and church-lands, the wise way is, to suffer the parochial relief to remain; to suffer the poor-laws to be duly and mercifully executed, and to **ABOLISH THE TITHES**. This would be doing justice to the people so far. But, there are the *taxes* before mentioned, the *malt-tax*, the *hop-tax*, and the *soap-tax*. The former tax alone would be enough to ruin any country upon the face of the earth. Malt produces *the drink of all the people*. This drink is necessary to the vigour, the activity, the good humour, and the health of the working people. At this time, at this place, malt is *ten shillings and sixpence the bushel*, and malting barley is *four shillings and threepence the bushel*. You all know well, that a bushel of barley makes a bushel of malt, and makes as much over as will pay the expense of malting. You all know that your fathers, or your grandfathers, used to take a sack of barley to the malt-house, and bring home a sack of malt *in exchange*. The tax upon the malt is half-a-crown a bushel, a great part of which goes to *pay the exciseman* for the trouble and persecutions he inflicts upon the maltster. At this time, therefore, the maltster has a *profit of three shillings and ninepence a bushel*; and yet, the maltster's trade is no more profitable than that of other people; for the various im-

pediments thrown in his way by the exciseman; the great injury done to his barley and his malt in its several stages, by his being compelled to submit to the numerous vexatious regulations imposed by the excise-office; the quantity of money which he is compelled to keep by him to pay the duty before he sells the malt; the great peril to which he is constantly exposed of being ruined by the exchequer: all these make it impossible that any but a rich man should be a maltster; and, thus, while his profits are not so very large, we who consume the malt, have to pay ten and sixpence for that which we ought to get for four shillings and threepence!

The *hop-tax*, though apparently a trifle in itself, is, if possible, still more odiously oppressive. The hops come in our hedges; yet we dare not stick a pole for them, and gather them in for our use, without exposing ourselves to prosecution and to a jail. In numerous instances, this hop-duty *amounts to less than is paid to the exciseman* for surveying and collecting the duties on hops; it is, in fact, so much money squeezed from us, and so much injury done to us, for the purpose of paying a parcel of idle fellows called excisemen, to come into our hop-gardens and our kilns, and domineer over us like so many masters. Were it not for this monstrous tax, every farmer would have a little bit of hops, enough for his own use, and every labourer would have a dozen or twenty hills in his garden, and not have to go to a shop to buy hops, if he were able to brew. God seems to have said to Englishmen, "*There are hops for you*:" the Government comes and says, "*You shall not have them*;" because, if "*you have, we shall not have employment for these troops of excisemen of ours*."

Two effects most cruelly injurious to farmers and labourers have arisen out of these oppressive taxes: the first, that the young men and maids have been, on account of the great expense of beer, driven from the farm-houses in greater proportion than they would have been: hence, they have been driven to the public-house, to a disorderly life, and to

all the other moral degradation that we witness. Hence the necessity of great jails and of tread-mills; hence STURGES BOURNE's *special vestry bills*: hence the HIRED OVERSEERS: hence the unnatural state of things between the labourers and the farmers: hence the deep-rooted resentment of the former; and hence the *constant alarm and sleepless nights* of the latter! And, until the abolition of the tithes, and the repeal of these monstrously oppressive taxes shall take place, never will there be, and never can there be, peace and happiness in England again.

Now, then, will Mr. DENISON pledge himself *to vote* for; not to support by speech, for that he is incapable of; but will he pledge himself *to vote* for the abolition of the tithes and the repeal of these cruel taxes? My opinion is, that he will not; and, my opinion is founded on the following facts. In the spring of 1829, I petitioned the House of Commons *to abolish the tithes*, and all the Protestant hierarchy in Ireland; representing to the House the monstrous injustice of compelling a Catholic people to give a tenth part of their produce to a Protestant clergy. I sent this petition to Mr. DENISON, in order that he might present it: he did present it; but he told the House, at the same time, that he most decidedly *protested against the principles of the petition and against its prayer!* I therefore, believe, that he will not vote for the abolition of tithes; and, for reasons to be presently stated, I believe, that he will not vote for the repeal of the taxes above mentioned; and, if there be a single man amongst you who vote for him, or for any other man, who will not pledge himself to such abolition and to such repeal, that man deserves to be taxed to the very breaking of his back; he deserves to be a slave all his life; and, at his death, to have the curses of those children upon whom he has entailed such degrading slavery.

Mr. Denison holds himself forth to you as a TRIED man; let us see how this matter stands. He has certainly been *tried* long enough; but let us look at the *result* of the trial. He has been

in Parliament, while in time of peace, he has seen the standing army amount to a hundred thousand or more; and within these two years he has seen it greatly augmented, *without a word of opposition from him.* He has sitten in Parliament while there have been a million and a half of money voted out of the taxes *as a present* to the church clergy, over and above the tithes and church-lands; and he has been there while *two millions of English money, since the peace*, has been voted to discharged Hanoverians; they with their wives and children being in Hanover! Ever since he has been in Parliament he has been voting annually a pension of two thousand four hundred a year to BURKE, *who died thirty-two years ago!* In 1821 he was in Parliament, when a committee sat to ascertain the cause of the *distresses of agriculture.* Mr. JOHN ELLMAN, of Sussex, told that committee that forty-five years before that, when he became a farmer, every man in his parish *brewed his own beer and enjoyed it by his fire-side*; and that now *not a single labourer in the parish brewed his own beer*, but had to drink water; and before the same committee the sheriff of Wiltshire said, that the labourers of that county, who used to have plenty of bread, meat, and beer, now went to plough with *cold potatoes in their bag*, and had nothing *but water to drink!* What! did Mr. Denison DO nothing in consequence of this? Did he make no motion for the House *to inquire* into the cause of this horrible change? Not he! Never opened his lips upon the subject; but, wrapping himself up in his tenfold garment of gold, jogged to Epsom at the next county meeting, turned up the whites of his eyes, and protested his anxiety to render the freeholders of the county all the service in his power! Either he has known what the people have suffered, or he has not; if the latter, he is too *ignorant* of our affairs to be intrusted with the management of them; if the former, he, having made no effort to lessen our burdens, is too *cold* and *unfeeling* a man to be intrusted with anything connected with our welfare, our peace, and our happiness. He



is a *money dealer*; he has no feeling in common with us, who must live by the land, or not live at all; his trade can flourish *only as long as we be loaded with taxes*; he knows, that to take off the taxes which press us to the earth, would *break up that system* which enables him to roll in endless riches. And, accordingly, during all the years that he has been in Parliament, he has *never made a motion for lessening those taxes*. This is a "*tried man*," then!

But he was once "*tried*" in a very particular manner; and from the result of this *trial* you will judge. A number of *farm-labourers at BARNES*, in this county, petitioned the House of Commons, in 1830, complaining, that the taxes, which they were compelled to pay on their malt, hops, soap, sugar, tea, tobacco, and wearing apparel, were squandered away on pensions, on sinecures, on German soldiers and their wives and children, who lived in Germany, spending the taxes, thus taken from the petitioners and their wives and children, and that the parsons and tax-gatherers made the farmers so poor, that they were unable to pay their people sufficient wages; and these labourers ended their petition by humbly praying, that the Parliament would redress these crying grievances, *and especially, that it would be pleased to repeal the taxes on malt, hops, sugar, soap, tea, and tobacco*. Nothing could be more humble than the language of this petition; nothing more in order or more pertinent than its *prayer*. The petition was communicated in the most respectful manner, to Mr. DENISON, with a request, that he would be pleased to present it, he being a member for the county in which the petitioners lived; and what did he do? What did he do on this *trial*? Why, he *declined* to present it; *did not like* to present it; *wished not* to present it; at last, he *refused* to present it; and, it was, therefore, carried to Mr. PALMER, who presented it *without hesitation*, as it was his bounden duty to do! This is a "*TRIED MAN*," is he? Better have a man that has not been tried. Better have anything than a man like this, unless he *will now pledge himself to the*

*repeal of the malt, the hop, and the soap-tax, and to the abolition of tithes*.

Besides all this, there is Denison's *double-dealing* with regard to Mr. LEECH. His crafty adherents got Mr. Leech to come out to *stand with Denison* against Sumner; and, Mr. Leech in that address, in which he yielded to the pressing invitation, gave us to understand, that he was a candidate *with Denison*; and he called upon the people *to support Denison as well as himself*, and thus to unite against the notorious Tory, Sumner. But now, mark! While the crafty money-monger was thus setting on foot underhandedly a mode of *getting split votes with Mr. Leech*, he was, at the same time, *carrying on an independent canvass for himself*, telling all those of whom he asked votes, that *he asked only for ONE vote*, never mentioning Mr. Leech; never mentioning Leech *in any of his bills*, or in any of his *canvassing cards*; while Mr. Leech, in all his bills and cards, has been *canvassing for Denison as well as for himself*! This is so low, so dirty, so vile a trick, that, every man who has promised his vote for Denison, upon the ground that he was a *joint candidate with Leech*, is, by this foul conduct of Denison, *clearly absolved from that promise*, because having given the promise on the understanding that *both were to be voted for all the way through*; and that Denison *wished for Leech to be elected along with him*; having given the promise upon this understanding, the promise *does not hold*, when it is proved that Denison wishes to be *elected himself*, though to the *exclusion of Leech*; and this exclusion; the success of this foul scheme of Denison, is to be prevented only by your *voting for LEECH, and not voting for Denison*. Sumner's supporters are all tax-gatherers, pensioners, placemen, half-pay-people, parsons, and others *who live on the taxes and the tithes*; these and their stewards and other dependants, and the renters under them; these are the supporters of Sumner. They have *no fear of Denison*, because they know that he *WILL NOT* vote for the *abolition of the tithes* and for the *repeal of the taxes*. But they

know that LEECH will, and therefore their object will be *to keep out Leech*; and if they find that Sumner is safe, they will *split with Denison*, in order to effect this object; and the selfish MONEY-MONGER will *split with them in exchange*, in order to secure his own seat. The only way, therefore, for us to *make sure* of Mr. Leech, is to give him, and *him only*, our votes; and I do beseech you all to attend to this.

But some may say, "*If we do not choose DENISON, we shall let in SUMNER.*" But, *as things now stand*, the chances are, *that you will keep out Leech, and let in Sumner too!* It is Mr. Leech that we want; and a great deal better for us would it be to have *him and Sumner*, than to have *Sumner and Denison*. With Leech and Sumner we have a *good* and a *bad*: with Sumner and Denison we have two *tried men*; one that has proved himself *bad*, and the other that has proved himself *good for nothing!* In short, if you suffer Denison's underhanded tricks to prevail, this part of the county of Surrey will have done all that it can possibly do to prevent the Reform Bill from producing any good; all that it can possibly do to do injury to the country at large; all that it can possibly do to cause the county of Surrey to be covered with everlasting disgrace.

Thus, my friends, countrymen, and neighbours, have I offered you along with my great respect and regard, and with that frankness and plainness which were called for by the pressing importance of the case; thus have I offered you my opinions upon this subject, and also the reasons upon which these opinions are founded; and having thus discharged my duty, it only remains for me to express my confident hope, that you will have the resolution honestly to discharge yours; in which hope, and with the most anxious wishes for the prosperity and for the maintenance of the honour of my native county, I remain

Your faithful

and most obedient servant,

WM. COBBETT.

POSTSCRIPT.—Be pleased to observe, my friends and countrymen, *FIRST*, that

our first object is, to return Mr. LEECH, for these reasons: That we have all known him from our infancy; that we have his seventy years of benevolent life as landlord and kind neighbour, and of *goodness to the poor*; that we have, in his character, in his invariable conduct, and in every other circumstance that can give us assurance, the certainty that he will do everything in his power to redress our grievances. It is, therefore, our first object to secure the return of Mr. Leech. *SECOND*, it is our duty to reject SUMNER, who has invariably shown that he is an enemy of our liberties, and that he has no desire to better our lot, or to enable us to better that of our poor neighbours. *THIRD*, if we must choose between the rejection of Denison and the rejection of Leech, *our duty to ourselves and to our neighbours* calls upon us to reject Denison, he being a man on whom we cannot rely. Therefore, my advice to you, offered with great respect to you and with every kindly feeling towards you, is this: that at the nomination at the election at Guildford, if not before, you put to the three candidates the following questions:

*I. Will you vote for the total and entire abolition of tithes, in England as well as in Ireland, leaving it to the House of Commons and the other two branches of the Legislature, to settle upon what provision, short of tithes, shall be allotted to the clergy?*

*II. Will you vote for the absolute, entire and complete abolition of the taxes on malt, on hops, and on soap?*

My advice to you is, not to vote for any man who will not pledge himself upon these two points; who will not answer YES, without any hesitation, to both of them; and next, my advice is, to consider well *whether voting for Denison be likely to endanger the election of Mr. Leech*, and if, upon consideration, you are of opinion that your voting for Denison may *endanger the election of Mr. Leech, not by any means to vote for Denison*. All the circumstances considered, it will be infamy to us not to return Mr. Leech. It will be to show a want, either of common discernment or of common in-



*tegrity*, to prefer a mere MONEY-MONGER, whom we know nothing at all of, except that he has represented us *twenty years*, and has done nothing for us; to prefer this man merely because he has a great heap of money (which, in fact, he has got *out of our toil*), to our neighbour, to the very best landlord, the very kindest friend to the poor that is to be found in the whole county, or in the whole of England itself! This would be infamy indeed upon our heads; our children would blush for the conduct of their fathers; to have it said of the people of Surrey, that, when all the millions of Englishmen were faithfully doing their duty, the county of Surrey was so base as to sell itself to the *breakfasts and dinners of a money-monger*!

#### WESTMINSTER ELECTION.

THIS matter grows hot. The enraged DON and his man have had the folly to make an attack on Mr. PLACE; though he really appears to have gone as far as possible, in order to save them. The consequence of this attack has been natural enough. Mr. PLACE repels the attack, and is compelled to expose the "chaise-horse" and the HOBBY to shame. "Dear DE VEAR" answers Mr. PLACE, and insinuates the base calumny which his employers had not the courage to utter. Mr. PLACE replies, and proves DE VEAR and his masters to be both liars and fools. They are, however, about to receive their just reward; they are about either to be pelted from the hustings with *cabbages and turnips*, or to show that they are afraid to meet the people whom they pretend to represent.

"Cast your bread upon the waters," is a precept which I have constantly kept in view, during the whole of my political life. I have been casting my bread, in the case of these two false fellows, for pretty nearly *fifteen years*. This is a great many *days*, certainly; but the bread has appeared again at last. This instance of the fruit of perseverance ought to be a great encouragement to all those who are apt to shrink

from the duty of assailing powerful adversaries. The rule is, "Keep truth constantly on your side; KEEP ON; and you are sure to prevail in the end. I here insert the letters before mentioned: they are full of interest; and my readers, in particular, will be delighted to see the greatest and basest of all my calumniators dragged down into the very dirt by those who have hitherto supported him. Major CARTWRIGHT should have lived to see this day: he should have lived to read Mr. PLACE's letter. And then to have seen, and read again, the letters which I addressed to himself from LONG ISLAND, upon the subject of BURDETT's treachery. The MAJOR stuck to him two years too long. I told him, in the presence of Mr. FITTON of ROYTON, who recollects it very well, that *he must give the fellow up first or last*; and that the sooner he did it the less cruel would his mortification finally be. This was in January, 1817; and, the MAJOR did not give him up until January, 1819; and then he was compelled to proclaim him hypocrite, political traitor, and everything else that was bad in public life. I shall here publish again this letter of Major CARTWRIGHT. The people of WESTMINSTER ought now to read it with attention. If they do, they will make amends by their present conduct for their senseless conduct in the time that is past. I beg all my readers to read this letter of MAJOR CARTWRIGHT with attention. He addressed it to the people of WESTMINSTER, and he published it at that time. I beg my readers to read my introduction to the address of MAJOR CARTWRIGHT. I republished the MAJOR's address on the 24. of December last; and I put this introduction to it. I beg my readers to look at the motto to this present *Register*; and they will see how right I was with regard to the fate of this fellow in case of a parliamentary reform taking place. About this day week (next Tuesday), he will be very nearly in the plight to which I said I would bring him, fifteen years ago. Let him, when he goes to bed next Tuesday night, reflect on his conduct towards Mr. PAULL, and on his still more infamous and base ingrati-

tude towards me. Let him then think of the nothingness of his twenty thousand acres of land, and calculate how much more it is worth than the six by two feet which are allotted to the miserable paupers upon his immense estates.

WM. COBBETT.

A LETTER  
TO THE  
ELECTORS OF WESTMINSTER,  
FROM  
FRANCIS PLACE.

GENTLEMEN,

Few, who were not actually public men, have, in relation to public matters, been more abused than I at times have been. To be abused was, I knew, the penalty I incurred for my interference; and as I incurred the penalty knowingly, I had little reason to complain; and I never have complained. Every one who chose has written of me to please himself; and every one who chooses may please himself in the same way.

I address you—not in defence of myself, for that I should scorn to do—but to prevent your being imposed upon and misled in a matter which I, as well as many of you, think of importance.

Sir John Hobhouse, in his speech at the Crown and Anchor Tavern, on Monday, the 26. of November, is reported to have said—and my inquiries have satisfied me that he is correctly reported—that, “From the letter of the Colonel (Evans), it appeared that he, on the Friday (the 16.), had given his pledge to stand, and it was not for two or three days afterwards the pledges were demanded from him (Sir John). It was a mere *trick*, not of the Colonel’s, but of some of the electors, for whose enmity he was not aware of having given cause. He would ask the meeting from how many of the electors of Westminster did they think this demand originated? From 500?—No. From 50?—No. From 10?—No. But from *one individual*, whose letter he then had in his pocket, in which he says to the deputation, ‘*Mind you ask him before the public meeting, and be sure you publish his answer.*’”

It is my intention to prove ‘most

clearly, and put beyond all doubt, the fact, that Sir John wilfully misrepresented me for the purpose of deceiving you, than which I know nothing more disgraceful.

It may be necessary, in consequence of rumours carefully disseminated, for me to say, that I am not, and never was, a dangler at the heels of great men; never was a frequenter of great men’s houses, but have always avoided them. In no great man’s house have I ever sat down as a guest—in no one even as an ordinary acquaintance, save only in those of Sir Francis Burdett and Sir John Hobhouse; and in neither of these even, unless called to it by unavoidable business. That during the twenty-five years I have been politically acquainted with Sir Francis, I have not been probably twenty-five times within the doors of his house; and during the fourteen years of my political acquaintance with Sir John Hobhouse, I have not been in any apartment of his fourteen times. That, excepting in a public room, I never ate or drank with Sir Francis, and but once with Sir John, at breakfast, when I met some gentlemen from Lancashire, to promote the repeal of the duty on printed calico. Standing thus, then, not under the slightest obligation to any political man, I may, I think, be allowed to adopt as independent a tone, and claim to be permitted to act as freely, as any other person whatever.

Sir John Hobhouse thanks me for my interference. He tells you this in bitterness of heart—the consequence of his own ill conduct. He is conscious that he deserves to lose his seat, and he knows well enough that in refusing the pledges, he has risked the throwing it away for ever.

He tells you that Colonel Evans gave his pledge on the Friday, and that the deputation was a trick of mine out of enmity to him. God knows I have no enmity towards him, and he too, knows it. He knows me too well to believe I can have any enmity towards him. I know not what Sir John means by Col. Evans being pledged on the Friday: I have no knowledge of his being pledged



till the Monday, more than twenty-four hours after Sir John had seen the deputation, and refused to answer the reasonable questions they asked him. Sir John did indeed know that Colonel Evans had not been pledged on the Friday, for he told the deputation he knew all that had been done; and I have since learned that there was no meeting on the Friday, nor on any preceding day. Sir John perverts the truth to make a point in his case. I do not know how Colonel Evans could be pledged until the Monday evening, but I do know that several of the highly respectable electors who took part in the proceedings, as well as Colonel Evans himself, anticipated Sir John's acceptance of the four propositions; had he done so, the matter must have ended there, and neither pledging nor nominating of Colonel Evans could have taken place.

I believe the simple facts to be these: it was provisionally agreed on the Saturday evening, that if Sir John rejected the four propositions, Colonel Evans should be nominated; I know positively that no other step was taken by anybody until after the return of the deputation on the Sunday from Sir John, and that Colonel Evans gave no pledges until the Monday evening.

The whole case may be shortly stated thus: for several years past many electors who had to transact business with Sir John, were displeased with his deportment towards them, and with his conduct respecting business in his hands; their complaints continually increased, and dissatisfaction prevailed to a considerable extent. Sir John was not ignorant of these circumstances; they were well known to me, and my communications with him were perfectly candid; he could and did receive them as often as he pleased; and so he did on some occasions those of a common friend. He was not ignorant that he risked the loss of his seat. In 1830, he had great apprehension of losing it, and although when he accepted office, he ran no risk of his re-election, he was forewarned that he might not be returned to the new Parliament.

The office he holds is the most obnoxious of any public office to the people; and circumstances occurred which from time to time, continued to lessen him in the opinion of his constituents; about three months since, several electors from two of the parishes, and a few days afterwards, others from another parish called upon me, and invited me to become a candidate for the City and Liberty, assuring me of the support of those with whom they were connected, and of the probable chance there was of success. These invitations I declined.\* Similar applications were made to Mr. Hume, and were also declined by him. Of these and other such symptoms, Sir John was not ignorant; and it was impossible for him either to misunderstand or to disregard them. The electors in several places occasionally communed together on the subject, and the desire to have a representative not encumbered with office—one to whom access could be easily and conveniently obtained—one who would not consider his prompt interference in such public matters, as might be thought necessary, a burden—one who would never neglect such public matters—became more and more evident. Within the last month many electors called upon me and expressed their desire to nominate another candidate, I did not think these demonstrations would lead to any nomination, but at length men began to take part in them, whom I knew were not likely to trifle with anything they took in hand: and the matter began to assume a serious aspect—all appeared to fear that Sir John would not be an active useful man for the people; some proposed that all the leading pledges, about nine in number, should be put to him: others again could not persuade

\* Offers were made to me from two other places, at one of which I have little doubt I might have been returned free of expense; reasons of a private nature made the acceptance of so very handsome an offer ineligible; yet, the gabbling old lady, the *Globe*, who is better acquainted with my affairs than I am myself, has discovered that the nomination of Colonel Evans is only a *ruse* to prepare the way for my becoming a candidate for Westminster.

themselves that the Secretary at War would be the independent member for Westminster they wished he should be. It was alleged—1. That Sir John's being Secretary at War was a conclusive objection. That it was useless to have any conference or to put any questions to him; and that the proper mode of proceeding would be to oppose him at once. I did not approve of these notions. 2. That from just apprehension that Sir John would not be an efficient representative, it was proper to come to a clear understanding with him before any thing of a decisive nature was done, and in this opinion all whom I saw at length concurred.

It was now certain that opposition to Sir John would be made, unless he gave such pledges as might be deemed necessary; and the question was—what pledges were necessary? That many pledges have in other places been demanded—that many candidates have voluntarily given pledges, you all know. It appeared to me, that in the case of Sir John, considerable allowance ought to be made; and the numerous pledges, which some had thought necessary, were reduced by me to four; and these were such, and such only, as Sir John had himself volunteered; such, as he would be expected openly to maintain as member for Westminster—such, as an honest man, he would be desirous to maintain, and such as the Government, if it really meant fairly by the people, could not object to permit him to maintain. To these four reasonable propositions, the electors whom I saw, agreed to limit their request; and to these, the electors who afterwards assembled at the Salopian Coffee-house, limited them. Never having assisted in any way to return any man for Westminster on his own account, but solely on public grounds, and to promote reform; it could not have been expected by Sir John, to whom my opinions were well known, that so far as I interfered, I should depart from the line of conduct I had followed for upwards of twenty-six years; and he ought to have been satisfied with the pains I took to limit the questions, and to have believed that

there could be nothing personally hostile to him in the proceeding; and I cannot even now persuade myself, that he does really believe there was any such feeling, notwithstanding he has so unqualifiedly asserted the contrary.

But it is said, why should any question be asked, why any pledge demanded of Sir John—he has been in Parliament twelve years, and his conduct ought to be taken as a sufficient pledge. It has been seen, that his conduct was not such as to satisfy a very large proportion of highly respectable and intelligent reformers, his constituents. That this was so is beyond all dispute; it was occasionally declared in many places—was talked of in the club-houses, by friends and foes.

It had come to my knowledge in ways which did not permit me to doubt, that Ministers were desirous to avoid taking steps towards enabling the people to reap any of the advantages they reasonably expected from the Reform Bill. The bill was to be allowed "to take its own course." In plain language, was to be a dead letter. I had heard enough in conversation with Sir Francis Burdett and Sir John Hobhouse, to satisfy me, that their notions corresponded with those of the Ministers, and no further changes seemed likely to be promoted by them; that this was a correct inference is now proved by the fact, that not one word in reference to any sort of reform whatever, has escaped from the tongue or the pen of either of the baronets. No, we were to sit down, quiescent and contented, until the termination of the next Parliament, when, if the bill remains as it is, every borough in the kingdom will be utterly corrupt, and every election a contest of the purse.

Under these circumstances, I felt it my duty to go along with the electors as far as I have stated; there was no disguise, no sort of concealment, and Sir John might have learned from me, from a common friend, or from any one of a pretty large number of electors, every thing that passed.

During this period, application had been made to Colonel Evans to become a candidate, and, after much inter-



course to which I was not in any way a party, it was agreed, that a meeting should be held on the evening of Saturday, the 17. November, for the purpose of ascertaining how far they who might choose to attend, could concur in any mode of proceeding.

About two hours before the meeting was held, several electors, one only of whom was known to me personally, being desirous to obtain my opinion on certain points, in writing, sent me a note, to which I replied by letter. The letter was lost by the person intrusted to carry it to the Salopian Coffee-house; and this obliged me to write another from memory, which, as will be seen, differs in no essential particular. On the morning of Monday, the 19. the last letter was brought to me by Mr. Warburton, in an open envelope; it had been picked up, opened, and sent to Sir John Hobhouse, who gave it to Mr. Warburton for me, and copies of both the letters with a note, were sent to Sir John, as follows, viz.—

*Monday, 19. Nov., 1832.*

SIR JOHN,—Mr. Warburton brought me the letter you put into his hands; Colonel Jones and Mr. Carpue were present when he came.

Mr. Warburton is acquainted with all the political matters in which I have for some time past interfered. Colonel Jones came to "put me to the question," in consequence of some reports he had heard at Ridgway's, which he thought were derogatory to me. I know not why I should have any secrets on political matters, and I have none; at least, none of my own. I therefore, in the presence of the other gentlemen, gave full answers to Colonel Jones's questions, and such matters of proof as I have by me. His questions related to Westminster and to you, and Mr. Warburton will tell you his opinion\* on these subjects. If you are satisfied—well; if you are not, I cannot help it.

I send you a copy of the letter you returned by Mr. Warburton. You have seen that it was directed to "*Mr. Michie or the Chairman*," and was consequently intended to be read to the company, if either Mr. Michie, the chairman, or any one of the gentlemen to whom it was addressed, chose to read it; the letter was sent to the Salopian Coffee-house at eight o'clock in the evening, and was lost

by the messenger. On learning this, I wrote another from memory, as I had not taken a copy; and I now send you a copy of both letters. "Politics make no friends," and he who acts honestly, and on his own opinions, can never hope long to please anybody; this is my case, and as it is unavoidable, I am contented it should remain so.

Yours,

FRANCIS PLACE.

Letter which was lost.

*17. November, 1832.*

MY DEAR SIR,—You and your friends ask me:

1. "If I concur with them in thinking that Sir John Hobhouse should be questioned?"

—I answer, I do.

2. "If he should be questioned without delay, or if it should be done at a public meeting?"—I answer, to-morrow morning, at whatever place he may be, either in town or country.

It is also my opinion, that the questions and answers should be published as soon as possible. Everything done by anybody relating to the electors should be communicated to them as was done formerly, and their acceptance or rejection of everything proposed should be asked.

I hear that Sir Francis Burdett, in a letter read from him last night, said, that none but fools asked for pledges, and none but rogues gave them.† True, he was not asked for pledges, yet he has given more than any other public man. Sir John Hobhouse was not only asked for pledges, but was most particularly questioned, and he pledged himself as far as was requisite; if, then, what Sir Francis says be correct, we are all fools, and he and Sir John are rogues.

Sir John has done four things, which I consider fundamental, as including all manner of details; and if he does not pledge himself to promote them, I will not vote for him, no, nor for any man who will not: they are—

1. Vote by ballot.
2. Repeal of Septennial Act.
3. Repeal of taxes on knowledge.
4. Repeal of assessed taxes, on account of their gross and shameful inequality.

I can see no reason why Sir Francis should now refuse, if he does refuse, to do as he did in former times—tell the people—that is, promise the people—that is, pledge himself to the people—that he will endeavour to procure for them certain things; and as to Sir John, his very situation as a Minister of State makes it not only absolutely necessary that he should pledge himself explicitly, but that, as an honest man, he should desire to do so. No man

\* Mr. Warburton's opinion, expressed before Colonel Jones and Mr. Carpue, was all that any honourable man could desire should be said of his conduct by such a man as Mr. Warburton.

† This, as I am assured, was the fact; and as the letter was intended for publication, it was returned to Sir Francis by Messrs. De Vear, Thurston, and A'Beckett, to be altered in this and some other particulars, and it was altered.

ought to consent that any one should be his master for SEVEN years, instead of being the people's servant for ONE year, without making terms with him.

I dislike Mr. De Vear's proceedings exceedingly; they are not such as an honest man should have anything to do with;\* and if anything could just now induce me to come out, these proceedings would. I am not, however, inclined to take upon myself the management of another contested election; there are plenty of intelligent men, younger than I am, and some of them should take the labour, the loss, and the obloquy, as I have done.

Yours, very truly,

FRANCIS PLACE.

To Mr. Michie, for Messrs. A. Michie, Arbor, Green, Wilson, Redman, and Savory.

Addressed,

"Mr. Michie, or the Chairman."

Letter written to supply the place of that which was lost, read at the Sapiopian Coffee-house.

17. November, 1832.

MY DEAR SIR,—You and your friends ask me:

1. "If I concur with them in thinking that Sir John Hobhouse should be questioned?"—I answer, I do.

2. "If this should be done by a deputation or delayed until a public meeting is held?"—I answer, to-morrow morning, by a deputation to him wherever he may be, either in town or country, and the questions and answers should be made public as soon as possible. Whatever is done, should, as formerly, be made known to the electors, that they may either concur in, or disapprove of the proceedings.

I am told that Sir Francis Burdett, in a letter which was read last night at the Crown and Anchor Tavern, said, "That none but fools demanded pledges, and none but rogues gave them." It is true that no pledges were demanded of him, he had earned his fame before he came to Westminster; not so Sir John. Sir Francis, without being asked, has given more pledges than any other public man. Sir John was not nominated until he had fully pledged himself. If, therefore, what Sir Francis now says be correct, we are all fools, and he and Sir John are both rogues, but it is not so.

Sir John has made four distinct things his own by his advocacy of them, and I will neither vote for him, nor for any other man, who refuses to promise to promote their accomplishment; they are,

1. Voting by Ballot, all-important Ballot.
2. Repeal of the Septennial Act.

\* To prevent cavilling, I beg to be understood as alluding to Mr. De Vear's political proceedings. In his social relations, and as a tradesman, he is a most respectable man.

3. Repeal of the Taxes on Knowledge.

4. Repeal of the Assessed Taxes, on account of their unequal and consequently unjust distribution.

I care little about details, as these four or even the two first of them, will enable the people to obtain all they can reasonably desire. Sir John's situation makes it the more necessary that he should unequivocally, and as an honest man, desire to have a public opportunity to do so. It is but little after all that is asked; it is no boon; nothing but the means of quietly promoting good government by destroying bad government in a legal way. It is too much of any man to desire people to make him their master for SEVEN years, instead of the people's servant for ONE year, without agreeing on the terms.

I dislike the proceedings of Mr. De Vear exceedingly; they are such as an upright man should have nothing to do with, such as, if I were not just now resolved to remain at home, would induce me to go out and help to manage another contested election, but there are many intelligent men, younger than I am, who should spend their time, incur the loss, and bear the odium as I have done.

Yours truly,

FRANCIS PLACE.

To Messrs. Michie, Arbor, Green, Wilson, Redman, and Savory.

It will not, I think, be easy for any one who has read these letters, to conceive the possibility of more perversion in so few words, as in those which have been quoted from the speech of Sir John Hobhouse.

1. That Colonel Evans was pledged on the Friday, qualified by the pitiful subterfuge, "it appears by his letter," the letter being actually dated "*Sunday*." Can Sir John think such conduct as this will pass unnoticed?

2. Sir John told the deputation on the Sunday, that he knew all their proceedings correctly, and, consequently, he knew that there could be no pledging on the Friday; he knew that no meeting was held till the Saturday evening.

3. Sir John knew, from the very nature of the case, that if any pledge was given on the Saturday, it could only be conditional. His emissaries were at the meeting, and he must therefore have known, that in the opinion of many, his acceptance of the pledges was expected, and that the business would end there.

4. Sir John says that I wrote to the deputation and instructed them what to do, when he knew that no deputation was



appointed, and it was uncertain that any would be appointed.

Parliamentary men, and especially men in office, frequently take liberties with truth in a way unknown to other men; but few, even of such men, would have ventured so openly to outrage truth and decency, as Sir John has done in this instance.

What must you, the electors of Westminster, think of Sir John when you look back at the quotation from his speech, and there read that the demand for pledges from Sir John was a *trick* of "one individual," whose letter he had in his pocket, in which he says to the deputation, "Mind you ask him before the public meeting, and be sure you publish his answer." No man can mistake the meaning of these words—no one mistake the affectation of mystery respecting the letter—the letter sent to him by myself, with the proffered means, through Mr. Warburton, of the knowledge that by me he had been handsomely treated, and had only not been preferred by me to my public duty. Had he followed a plain honest course, he would have told the truth—the whole truth; he would have scorned the use of falsehood, been above misrepresentation, and instead of using words as a quotation from the letter, which it does not contain, he would have read the letter. Why then did he not read the letter? Let any man who has read it answer the question. The words used by Sir John admit of but one interpretation, that of mean base fraud; he intended them to have that meaning and no other. The words in the letter have precisely the contrary meaning to those he used. They are, "It is also my opinion that the questions and answers should be published as soon as possible." And why be thus published? The reason follows, "because, that any thing done by anybody relating to the electors, should be communicated to them as was done formerly, and their acceptance or rejection of every thing proposed should be asked." Is this compatible with base trickery? Is it not contemptible trickery in Sir John to act as he did, and has he not deserved the exposure of his trick-

ery? He knew well enough there was no trickery in any part of my conduct, yet has he had the folly and effrontery to pretend there was, to make a mystery of the contents of the letter, and for a bad purpose to quote as a passage, words it did not contain.

With Sir John I have been pretty closely engaged in some public matters, sufficiently disagreeable; yet even after the conduct I have been compelled to expose, I cannot persuade myself he will pretend that, in any one instance, I ever gave in to a single act for which any man might not take credit to himself.

With this statement of facts before you, with conduct on the part of Sir John, so highly disreputable, amounting to a tacit avowal that from him you are not to expect any assistance in the work of quiet legal regeneration; with conduct which proves that he no longer considers himself bound to comply with any wish of yours, however reasonable, or to attend to any interest of yours, which, from any cause at any time, may not be equally agreeable to himself and to Ministers; will you place those interests in his hands to be disposed of as he chooses for seven years, without the smallest power of control, without any of calling him to account, be his conduct whatever it may?

What was good for the people in 1819 is good for them now; what Sir John recommended then, should be the rule now; what he deprecated in the Whigs then, he is now practising himself to the very letter. There is one difference only between those whom he then so properly reprobated and himself, and that is, that they never treated the electors as their dependents, and never pretended to treat them with such perfect indifference as Sir John does now.

The electors must be much changed for the worse if they do not assert their own dignity, and reject the man who has so shamelessly deserted and insulted them.

FRANCIS PLACE.

30. Nov. 1832.

P. S. Some of the most active partisans of Sir John Hobhouse, are diligently propagating a report, that the

opposition to Sir John has been got up by me, in consequence of his refusing to procure for me the office of Official Assignee under the new Bankruptcy Act. The fact is this, I was solicited, in the handsomest manner, to accept the office; but, as it was incompatible with my other pursuits, I declined it. Sir John Hobhouse was acquainted with the circumstance, but he was in no way concerned with it.

F. P.

(From the *Morning Chronicle*, 4 Dec. 1832.)

To the Editor of the *Morning Chronicle*.

SIR—The committee for conducting the election of Sir Francis Burdett and Sir J. Hobhouse trust that your sense of justice will induce you to give insertion to the enclosed address to the electors of Westminster, having this day inserted a letter which contains a severe attack upon one, at least, if not on both, of the present members.

THOMAS DE VEAR, Chairman.

December 3, 1832.

A letter signed Francis Place has appeared in the *Chronicle*, and is now circulated as a pamphlet, containing a charge against Sir John Hobhouse, which those who do not know the writer may think it necessary should be refuted. The accusation is spread over fifteen pages, but the basis of it is contained in the first page, and is as follows:—"Sir John Hobhouse, in his speech at the Crown and Anchor Tavern, on Monday, the 26. of November, is reported to have said (and my inquiries have satisfied me that he is correctly reported), that from the letter of the Colonel (Evans), it appeared that he on Friday, the 16., had given his pledge to stand, and it was not for two or three days afterwards the pledges were demanded from him (Sir John). It was a mere trick, not of the liberals, but of some of the electors, for whose enmity he was not aware of having given cause. He would ask the meeting from how many of the electors of Westminster did they think this demand originated? From 500?—No. From 50?—No. From 10?—No. But from one individual, whose letter he had in his pocket, in which he says to the deputation. 'Mind you ask him before the public meeting, and be sure you publish his answer.'"

Having giving this in this pamphlet as an extract from Sir J. Hobhouse's speech, and having satisfied himself of the correctness of the report, Mr. Francis Place, proceeds to found a charge of untruth, conveyed in the coarsest language, against Sir John Hobhouse, by stating that Colonel Evans did not enter into an engagement to stand on the Friday, and that his standing was only provisionally agreed upon on the Saturday. Now, what is to be thought of Mr.

Francis Place, when it is proved, by appealing to the *Times*, the *Chronicle*, and the *Morning Herald*, and it might be added, to all whom Colonel Evans's supporters would allow to hear Sir John Hobhouse, that he (Mr. Place) had put into Sir John's mouth words which he never used: and that this person, who says he had "satisfied himself of the correctness" of what he attributes to Sir John Hobhouse, could not have looked into either of these papers, or if he did look into them, could not find a single phrase to justify his slander; the *Times* gives an accurate report, the *Morning Herald* does the same, the *Morning Chronicle* omits that part of the speech altogether, but does not give one word of Mr. Francis Place's correct report. In the *Morning Herald* of Nov. 27, we find as follows:—

"It was not true that the opposition to him (Sir J. H.) arose from his refusing to give pledges. The opposition, according to a letter written by Colonel Evans, had been settled on Saturday night; the gallant Colonel had accepted the offer of being put in nomination on the Saturday night, and the pledges were never proposed to him (Sir J. H.) until the Sunday morning."—*Extract from Sir J. Hobhouse's speech.*

The report of the *Times* is to the same effect.

"It is not true that the opposition to me has arisen from my refusal to take the pledges: it began before that refusal occurred. It was on the Saturday night that it was settled (as appeared from the letter of the gallant Colonel himself) that he should stand in opposition to me; and the pledges were never put to me until the following Sunday morning."—*Extract from Sir J. Hobhouse's speech, Times, Nov. 27.*

It will be seen that, by the substitution of Friday instead of Saturday, and by the insertion of two or three days, instead of the following day, Mr. Francis Place has ingeniously contrived to put a falsehood into the mouth of Sir John Hobhouse, for the sake of afterwards accusing him of that crime. After the exposure of this forgery (where the mis-report given by Mr. Place is found we know not), it will be scarcely necessary to reply to any other portion of this libel. But, besides the main invention on which Mr. Place depends for producing the intended effect with the electors of Westminster, his letter contains two or three other fictions, which it may be as well to expose. He declares that even on the Saturday night it was agreed upon (only provisionally) that Colonel Evans should stand, and that his coming forward depended upon Sir John Hobhouse's answers to the questions put to him on Sunday.

What says Colonel Evans?

Here is his letter:—

"MY DEAR SIR FRANCIS—For some time past various communications have been made to me by electors of Westminster, expressive of a desire to bring me forward as a candidate



for its representation in the next Parliament. Last night a meeting was held on this subject, when, it having been determined to put me in nomination, measures were taken to carry that determination into effect; and I, having conceded to the wishes of the electors, am now a candidate, without, as I fully understand, being in any way opposed to you. I hasten to communicate this to you, and remain, yours, &c. &c.

"D. L. EVANS.

"To Sir Francis Burdett,  
"Sunday, 6, Waterloo-place."

The words are positive that the arrangement was made on Saturday—not provisionally—but an actual determination to nominate Colonel Evans the night before Sir John Hobhouse was asked a pledge. There is no doubt that Sir John's refusal to pledge was mentioned as adding to the Colonel's chances. And it is repeated, that the Colonel's letter to Sir Francis Burdett states the fact broadly that the determination to nominate him (Colonel Evans) and the consequent measures were agreed upon on the Saturday. Sir John Hobhouse called this a trick. We repeat that it was so, and when Mr. Place wrote the letter which was picked up in the street, and which, when sent to Sir John, was returned, unread by that gentleman, to the writer, through Mr. Warburton, he knew that Sir J. Hobhouse would give no pledges, for he had said so in his address to the electors of Westminster, published a few days before; so that the specifying four questions to which answers were to be given, was neither more nor less than, as it was call by Sir Francis Burdett, "a poor contrivance" to injure Sir John Hobhouse on these four particular points with the electors.

Another of the tricks was to request Sir John Hobhouse to be a member of Mr. Hume's committee, which it was well known he could not, with the slightest regard to personal character, concede to; accordingly, his refusal has been made another charge against him.

Again, Mr. Francis Place complains of Sir John Hobhouse not having read his (Mr. Place's) letter to the meeting, and states that it would have disproved his assertions of the pledge deputation originating with him. Fortunately, that precious document has been published, and we are quite content to abide by it. Messrs. Michie and others ask Mr. Place, "Shall we demand pledges from Sir John Hobhouse?" Mr. Place answers "Yes," and bids them go about it directly, stating to them what these pledges ought to be.

They go accordingly and advance these very same pledges, and now Mr. Place has the amusing effrontery to pretend he did not send the deputation, and may wash his hands of the pledge trick.

But Mr. Place, not content with dealing thus *honestly* by Sir John Hobhouse, tries his hand with Sir Francis Burdett's letter. Here also he says what is unfounded—he states, he hears that Sir F. Burdett, in a letter read from him last night, said that "none but

fools asked for pledges, and none but rogues gave them," and adds, in a note, "This, as I am assured, was the fact; and as the letter was intended for publication, it was returned to Sir Francis by Messrs. De Veat, Thurston, and A'Beckett, to be altered in this and some other particulars, and it was altered." Now, upon referring to a copy of Sir Francis Burdett's letter, taken before it was returned to Sir Francis to be altered, according to Mr. Place's informant "in this and some other particulars," we find no such remark as that "none but fools asked for pledges, and none but rogues gave them." So much for the accuracy of Mr. Place's informant.

We cannot conclude without stating that we have heard of the report alluded to by Mr. Place's postscript, namely, that he (Mr. Place) had got up this opposition to Sir John Hobhouse, because that gentleman refused to procure for Mr. Place the office of official assignee under the new Bankruptcy Act. It probably originated in the same quarter as Mr. Place's false report of Sir John Hobhouse's speech.

(To the Editor of the Morning Chronicle.)

SIR—Reluctant as I am, and ever have been, individually to obtrude myself on the public, I cannot remain silent under an imputation, which, though having the semblance of an attack upon my public conduct, is, in fact, one upon my private integrity. I allude, Sir, to a handbill published by the friends of Colonel Evans, headed, "Twelve Questions for the Electors of Westminster," &c. The eleventh of these runs thus: "Who cares not a fig for the electors of Westminster, so long as he is supported by the contemptible little faction of electors and non-electors, the rump of Lisle-street, who manage matters very snugly, and never publish or exhibit their accounts?" Surely, Sir, the publication of this bill cannot have received the sanction of Mr. Place, because, after the close of my account as treasurer of the election of 1831, in the following note: "The foregoing account has been examined by us, and the documents of the treasurer compared therewith, and found to be correct. Signed—Francis Place, D. Newton Crouch, dated September 13, 1831." And also in a statement to the electors of Westminster, printed and circulated September 14, 1831, giving a succinct account of the elections of the preceding 24 years, in the following notice:—Mr. De Veat having laid his accounts and vouchers, before auditors, who have examined and attested the same, the said accounts and vouchers now lie for the inspection of subscribers, at his residence, 44, Lisle-street." I beg to conclude by stating, that those documents now lie at this committee-room for the purpose of examination.

I am, Sir, your very obedient servant,  
THOMAS DE VEAT.

Central committee-room, 43, Covent-garden, Dec. 3, 1832.

(From the Morning Chronicle of Dec. 5.)

To the Editor of the Morning Chronicle.

SIR—A paper is inserted in your journal of to-day, purporting to be an address from the committee of Sir Francis Burdett and Sir John Hobhouse, in which a passage is quoted from my "Letter to the electors of Westminster," and pronounced to be a "forgery." The best reply to this calumny is the statement of a fact. On the evening of Monday, Nov. 26. I received a copy of the *Sun* newspaper; it contained, what to me, who am well acquainted with newspaper matters, seemed a very excellent report of the proceedings at the meeting held that day at the Crown and Anchor Tavern. In it I read the words I copied into my letter. I did not, however, copy them until I had made inquiry; not, as is insinuated, from casual hearers, who, amidst the shameful uproar, might mistake Sir John's words, but from men of character accustomed to such scenes, whose station enabled them to hear, and on whose accuracy I can depend; on their assurance, I am satisfied the words I quoted were used by Sir John. So much for the forgery.

Another accusation is conveyed in these words:—"A letter signed Francis Place has appeared in the *Chronicle*, and is circulated as a pamphlet, which those who do not know the writer, may think it necessary should be refuted." The inference is, that they who do know the writer will not think any refutation necessary. Men who think meanly will seldom hesitate to lie boldly.

Mr. De Veaz is the tool used on this occasion. He is a good-natured man, easily made use of by those who will take the trouble to operate on his vanity; he, poor man, is made to represent me as not worthy of belief; yet, in a letter signed by him, and inserted in your paper, he says I audited and certified the correctness of his accounts as treasurer of the Westminster election in 1831. True, I did so, and so I will those of the present election, if he will lay them before me, and nothing improper should be found in them. But mark the inference of the charge he has made, and the consequence. Mr. De Veaz, who says I shall not be believed by those who know me, tells you that my certificate was all that was necessary as an assurance to the electors of Westminster for his honesty and the correctness of his conduct. So much for my not being worthy of belief.

The remainder of the complaints, lamentations, insinuations, and accusations of the committee of the two baronets, may be safely left to the unprejudiced readers of my "letter to the electors."

FRANCIS PLACE.

## MAJOR CARTWRIGHT'S EXPOSURE OF BURDETT.

MR. COBBETT's introduction to Major Cartwright's address, containing the exposure of Burdett, which introduction was published in the *Register* of 24. December, 1831.

The recent shuffling and cutting of this once-noisy "*patriot*," whom CANNING (in whose back the once-noisy blade stuck his knees in 1827), aided by GILLRAY and WRIGHT, once exhibited as "*Sixteen-String Jack*;" this obsolete "*patriot's*" recent miserable shuffling, with the POLITICAL UNION, to put himself at the head of which he was, it is now very clear, sent by the Ministers, for the purpose of making it, like himself, *useless*; this shuffling, which has, at last, shaken off from him even the base *wealth-worshipping* tribe, has, it seems, reminded a gentleman in the country, of the shuffler's vile treatment of MAJOR CARTWRIGHT; and the gentleman has written to me to know in what part of the *Register* it was that *I exposed that vile treatment*. It was not *I*, but the *Major himself*, who did it in a most complete manner; and this exposure I republish below. YOUNG MEN ought to know the whole history of this fellow's shufflings, that they may despise the wealth-worshipping wretches that still fawn upon him. A reformed Parliament puts an end to him; his shuffling upon a motion made by some one, to *sweep the pension and sinecure lists clean off the paper*; his shuffling upon a motion to "*TEAR THE LEAVES OUT OF THE ACCURSED RED BOOK*;" either of these will *finish* him. Oh! my God! how he dreads reform! Never did lazy, shirking, straight-backed Scotch bailiff so dread a *spade*, as this crafty, shuffling "*patriot*" dreads reform. The reader will see, that the Major exposed the shuffler in an *Address to the Electors of Westminster*, which he published in a pamphlet while I was in *Long Island*, which address was republished in the *Register*, in order to send the shuffler down to posterity in his true character and colours. The Major had been so fearful, lest an *open breach* with



the SHOY-HOY should injure that cause in which he had so long laboured, that he had *clung* to him long after his falsehood became evident to us all. Upon this I had remonstrated with the Major, that his hopes of reclaiming the SHOY-HOY were vain; that he *must come to an open breach with him at last; or, abandon the cause of reform himself.* My prediction was pretty soon verified, as the YOUNG MEN are now going to see; and herein they will see, too, how Westminster has been by this SHOY-HOY, aided by a villanous RUMP COMMITTEE, degraded *below* any rotten-borough in the kingdom; for, what rotten-borough ever yet was so base as to call "*its representatives*" two fellows whom the people, promiscuously assembled, had pelted off the hustings with *cabbages and turnips!* Reader, look at the conduct of this *putrid Rump!* They tell the SHOY-HOY that "*nobody but the Major is thought of,*" as his colleague; and, when they find that he will not have him, they *tack instantly about,* and support a creature of the Shoy-hoy's nomination *against the Major!*

### ADDRESS

TO THE

ELECTORS OF WESTMINSTER,

BY

MAJOR CARTWRIGHT.

(First published on the eve of the late Westminster election.)

February 4, 1819.

GENTLEMEN,

WHILE lately at Tunbridge Wells, I addressed to the Duke of BEDFORD, and to the public, a series of seven letters, as a sort of winding-up, if possible, of the long controversy of more than forty years' continuance, in support of such a constitutional reform in the representation of our country, as, it hath been abundantly demonstrated, is *alone* in strict accordance with that liberty which God bestowed *universally* on man; but which it has ever been the endeavour of the corrupt and tyrannical to monopolize to themselves, and otherwise to violate, for the oppression of their fellows.

It will readily be seen, that a principal

desire in these discussions has been, to attract the attention of the Whig aristocracy and their followers, among whom are chiefly to be found that class of persons, who, by a whimsical misapplication of language, call themselves *moderate reformers*; but whose errors, in fact, in the present advanced state of knowledge, are among the greatest obstacles to a recovery of our country's freedom and prosperity.

While so occupied, as aforesaid, I learned the loss we had sustained by the decease of the able and virtuous *Sir Samuel Romilly*, and that a few of my friends thought that, all circumstances now considered, I might be once more nominated to fill the vacancy in your representation so unhappily made, free from the difficulties which had unexpectedly started up at the general election. I was also informed how, in consequence of what occurred on the 17. of November, at the Crown and Anchor meeting, they were discouraged from naming me.

I am not aware that, after this, I should so soon again have taken up my pen, had it not been for a singular concurrence of circumstances. On the 17. of December, at the same instant, came to my hands, a *Birmingham Argus*, of the 12., containing "*Observations on the propriety of a public meeting, for the purpose of petitioning Parliament to adopt Major Cartwright's BILL;*" and a *Statesman*, containing a "*speech of Sir Francis Burdett, delivered at Liverpool.*" At the same time there lay on my table the three preceding *Registers* of *Mr. Cobbett*, all of which had been addressed to me personally, relative to what he termed *Sir Francis Burdett's "backing out;"* to the baronet's conduct towards me in the matter of the last Westminster election; and to his apparent courtship of the *moderate-reforming Whigs.*

The reflections which all these circumstances have generated in my mind, including the newspaper report of the proceedings at the Crown and Anchor Tavern, on the 13. of July, and again on the 17. of November, make the topics of the present address; in which

will be ultimately found, a COMPARISON between the *Birmingham observations* with *Sir Francis Burdett's* on the two days aforesaid in *Westminster*, in a third speech on the 4. of December, at *Liverpool*.

Although it is a principle with me, to refrain as much as possible from aught that is calculated to divide the friends of liberty, as well as to bear as much as possible of injurious treatment to the same end; yet, forbearance in an extreme must ever do more harm than good; and even division may benefit that cause, if by the parties divided it be made a right and honest use of.

In the *Political Registers* above mentioned, my conduct, relative to the great question of parliamentary reform, is touched on, as liable in some degree to *doubt* as to its propriety, in consequence of a supposed partiality, and improper "clinging" on my part to *Sir Francis Burdett*. Where thus some are ready to blame, because a man does not speak all he thinks, while others may be offended at his speaking freely, the task, in a case like mine, at the present time, is of some difficulty. But whatever opinion may be formed of my endeavour to keep the line of rectitude in a situation thus delicate, should but the public, and your representative, the baronet himself, receive from my observations a useful *warning*, I shall be so far content.

In the first place, anxious that the enlightened and sincere friends of public freedom, whose good opinion, beyond all things on earth, I most value, should not be induced, by Mr. *Cobbett's* doubts, to entertain unfavourable notions of the correctness of my conduct, I must presume that, had he not been so distant as he is, those doubts would never have been entertained; and, from what I now conceive that I am bound to say, will undoubtedly vanish.

For the tenderness shown by me to the baronet, in my address to you on the 11. of July, the aforesaid *Registers* themselves furnish abundance of apology, in attributing it to an anxiety not to injure the cause of freedom by speaking more plainly.

In the baronet's own words at *Liver-*

*pool*, I may even plead that "the sacrifice of a long-entertained opinion is difficult;" but the baronet, by his conduct on the whole, for some time past, has, I acknowledge, in a considerable degree, weaned me from an opinion with respect to himself, which I had very fondly entertained; and that conduct has in particular been such, of late, as to have placed me in a situation, in which to refrain from plain speaking, with regard to certain facts, as well as to suppress apprehensions for the public, which from those facts receive no small light, would savour too much of torpor where a great national interest is at stake, and a public duty is concerned. At the same time, I trust, it cannot be doubted, that no one will be more gratified than myself, should events prove me in error; and, indeed, that I may be an instrument towards that very proof, is not the least of the motives under which I now write.

In the second place, when I contemplate the juncture of a *new* Parliament under very *new* circumstances, as well as the present political aspect of all the civilized states in the old world and new, and ruminates on the signs of the times:—and when, in particular, I reflect on the critical state of that vital question—*parliamentary reform*—on which hangs the fate of my country; and believe I see danger in the conduct and language of one looked up to as a leader; can it be more than will be expected of me, to state the grounds of that belief, although that leader should be *Sir Francis Burdett*?

And thirdly, considering the cause of personal dissatisfaction given me by the party of whom I am to speak, it behoves me to keep a guard on myself, that I may neither injure the cause of reform, nor my own reputation, by language which could be interpreted as disregarding the public interest while gratifying a private feeling.

Still hoping after all I had observed, and the treatment I had experienced, that to support the baronet's election was to serve the cause of reform, it accorded with my notions of duty to give him, at the general election, my vote. And, I



presume, that the whole series of my letters to the Duke of *Bedford*, as yet only in part made public, will evince that *personal* considerations do not warp me either to the right hand or to the left, from my right to onward course, and that those letters will serve as beacons and finger-posts for directing on his way the political traveller in search of the principles of representation; so as that he may be secure against the attempts of false guides to lead him astray; provided only he have strength of mind, for preferring sound argument to hollow sophistry; solid demonstration to empty declamation.

I have already noticed the coincidence, respecting the *Birmingham observations* and the *Liverpool speech*, which coming on me at the same moment, excited a train of serious reflections. These opposite documents, when the speech at *Liverpool* was viewed in connexion with the two speeches at the Crown and Anchor, presented to my mind's eye a contrast as strong as that of frost to fire, darkness to light; prompting me to a COMPARISON, which may be of use to the friends of constitutional reform, by putting them on their guard against being misled. Should my remarks prove no incentive, they cannot become impediments, to performances truly patriotic; a reflection which reconciles me to an unpleasant task.

As an additional motive for exhibiting the *drift* of the documents, in a COMPARISON of one with the other, it was on a moment's reflection obvious, that it was of far more importance to guard against any evil to be apprehended from errors in the *author of the speeches*, than from errors in the *author of the review*, on whom in the foregoing letters to the Duke of *Bedford*, it will be found much attention had been bestowed.

That *reviewer* had no constitutional name that could give any false weight to his errors; the *baronet* has a great one for giving weight and currency to his. The *author of the review* had no reputation for knowledge in the science of representation; the *baronet* had much. The *author of the review* had no

character for a lofty exemption from faction, or for integrity as a patriot: the *baronet* had long stood high in these respects. Although of late his mysterious conduct had staggered the faith of observant persons; yet his having at length acceded to, and actually professed the doctrines of, *universal freedom* and the *ballot*, still enables him to keep possession—whatever may be the solidity of his titles—of the post of *parliamentary leader* in the business of *radical reform*.

If the mystery I have noticed did in reality proceed from a hope of making complete proselytes of the political pharisees of our country, how little soever we may acknowledge the wisdom of it, or how little soever we may in any view of it be able to approve of it as far as possible and as long as possible, it may be allowable in the liberal minded to put on it the most charitable construction. Time, which has cleared up greater mysteries, will clear up this.

Before proceeding, however, with comments on others, it is proper, according to what I have premised, to notice what is objected to myself. Mr *Cobbett* is extremely liberal of praise, for the services which, in his opinion, I have rendered the public, and the disregard I have therein shown to my own fair ambition; which disregard, he thinks, I have, however, carried to a blamable extreme; that, in short, respecting the line where sacrifices of this kind ought to end, I had "overstepped the mark, long and long ago." Here I might farther quote and argue to some extent in my own justification; but that I shall rather leave to my actions. Mr. *Cobbett* imputes to me that I still call Sir *Francis Burdett* "our leader;" whence he infers that I "cling" to the *baronet* somewhat improperly. It is true, that in addressing certain friends of reform, assembled on the 18. of August last, I certainly did so call the *baronet*, because he had taken a leading step in Parliament, towards the introduction of a BILL for a radical reform; and sincerely do I wish he may not compel me to cease calling him "our leader."

Should leaders err, they ought to re-

ceive counsel from such as are able to give it. The moving of propositions, which constitute the intended preamble of a BILL, entitles us to expect the BILL itself. A new Parliament has been a fortnight assembled. Ministers have made their motions. Opposition have made theirs. But the anxious friends of England's freedom have not yet observed that their LEADER has given any notice of a motion for leave to bring in a BILL for constitutional reform, infinitely more important than aught in contest between the ins and the outs!

I do not feel that I have any need to apologize for the extreme reluctance I had to saying, on the 11. of July, to my fellow-citizens, all I then thought of the conduct of Sir *Francis Burdett*; but enough, I think, was said to show that there was necessarily an end to any confidential intercourse between us.

The 12. of the questions which make part of my address is as follows:—  
“In proposing to the electors of Westminster a new man, altogether unknown in the field of reform, as the *personal friend of Sir Francis Burdett*, what was the inference likely to be drawn? What the effect actually produced?”

To which question this is the answer:—“It seemed to warrant an inference, that in respect of the *leader* and *lieutenant* ABOVE MENTIONED, between whom there had been *so much co-operation*, there had been *no friendship*.”

No human being could be supposed so dull as not to see in this passage my conviction that the description of the *new man*, so given by the committee, was, in fact, the baronet's own description, as a distinction between that *new man* and his *old reforming associate*.

On a private account, I have no pretence for taking exception to that distinction; of free and familiar as our *political* intercourse had for some years been, I never felt that I had the personal friendship of *Sir Francis*. Ours had not been a private friendship, but a political connexion; and on *political* grounds it had, as I thought, entitled me to a very different treatment than, at

his hands; on that public occasion—an occasion so very important to the cause of reform, and consequently of freedom—I experienced.

That the baronet's “*personal friend*” was likewise a fox-hunting companion, I well knew. But still I persuaded myself that the baronet's patriotism had been of the same kind as his, who, on a similar occasion had said, “I have no fox-hunting vote to bestow on any one; neither have I a vote for party, nor for connexion: no; nor even for sacred friendship. To my friend I will give my purse, my hand, my heart; but I will not give him that which is not mine. My vote I hold in trust; my vote belongs to my country; and my country alone shall have it.”\*

In the hope of representing Westminster, it did not become me to court the favour of the baronet, by the most indirect hints of wishing for his countenance, and I was proud enough to imagine it impossible that HE, of all men, should be the person to defeat my just and natural expectations.

For awhile previous to the election, I understood it to be a prevailing sentiment, that he who more than forty years ago had successfully vindicated the legislative rights of the commonalty,†—he who had been mainly instrumental in the enlightening of those whose petitions for parliamentary reform had not been scantily laid on the table, but had covered the very floor of the House of Commons; and he who in all ways had been indefatigable in the cause, and had, in particular, for several years, been in close connexion and co-operation with *Sir Francis Burdett*; was considered as having claims on his fellow-citizens, the electors of Westminster, so far outweighing any that would be opposed to them, that the baronet's name and his, as nominees for the representation of the

\* From an election speech at Lincoln, in 1796, published in “The Constitutional Defence of England, Internal and External,” p. 13.

† The work was entitled, *The Legislative Right of the Commonalty vindicated*. It was published in 1776.



city,—names so long united in the public service ought by no means to have been put asunder.

It was thought that the union of those names was so natural, so congenial with public feeling and public expectation, that it would call forth a support so unanimous and so ardent, as to cause an *undisputed return*; and to this day nothing has occurred to invalidate that opinion.

During the period alluded to, I could not walk the streets without having evidence of it. I remember, in particular, the salutations at different times, to that effect of *Sir John Throckmorton* and *Mr. Richard Sharp*; the latter, at that time, and I believe now again, in Parliament; and both, as I understood, members with *Sir Francis*, of Brookes's club, in St. James's-street.

I further learned that *Sir Francis Burdett*, having been waited on by *Mr. Cleary* and *Mr. Henry Brooks*, of the Strand, relative to business of a different nature, the baronet asked those gentlemen, "Who was thought of, to be put in nomination with him, for representing the city?" when the answer he received from *Mr. Henry Brooks* was this:—"Oh, Sir, no one is thought of but the old Major."

Considering the hold which "the old Major" then had on the affections and the confidence of the truly enlightened and sincere friend of constitutional reform, such news, if news it were, was of a nature, it might have been thought, to have gladdened the coldest heart in the coldest bosom of any *one belonging to that class* in the community: but it gladdened not the heart of *Sir Francis Burdett*!

Considering the obvious interest of that reform, and the plain-speaking dictate of honest policy, that the happily favouring circumstances for that great question should have been seized on with avidity, and promoted with ardour, while *Westminster*, true to her reputation, ought to have surpassed her sister cities of the metropolis in kindling up in the cause a patriot fire, whose rays should have diffused life and hope to the remotest borders of the land; was it

to have been expected that any man calling himself a constitutional reformer, could have been found, who was capable, of not merely throwing cold water on the kindling fire, but even of throwing down an apple of DISCORD, for defeating the proposed joint nomination?—But such a man was found in *Sir Francis Burdett*!—In *Sir Francis Burdett*, who, a *second* time within five months, joined in a concerted plan of operations for defeating the hopes of his quondam associate in the cause of reform, and who, on the 17. of November, harangued, with such art and emphasis on the value of UNANIMITY!

On receiving the information of *Mr. Henry Brooks*, the baronet perceived the hour for activity was arrived. It quickly produced a letter to the father, *Mr. Samuel Brooks*, naming three gentlemen, any one of whom might be considered as acceptable to the baronet, and worthy of being put in nomination with himself; in which letter, "the old Major" was neither named nor noticed.

The three so recommended, were *Mr. Fawkes* (whose determination, by the way, against going into Parliament, during the continuance of the present system, had been repeatedly declared), *Mr. Kinnaid*, and *Mr. Hobhouse*.

The baronet's fiat thus issued, all was instant alertness for *Mr. Kinnaid*, as the "personal friend" of *Sir Francis Burdett*. We know the rest. We know that on that occasion *Westminster* did not add to the phalanx of radical reform. We know that even the baronet was but second on the poll. And now we also know, that although in *June* it was but most incomprehensibly assigned as the baronet's reason for not naming as *Mr. Henry Brooks* had done to him, "the old Major," in his recommendatory epistle, that he "THOUGHT the Major did not wish for a seat in Parliament;" he (the baronet) in *November*, as a new reason for the exclusion was unfortunately become necessary, had accordingly discovered a new one—but not a whit less incomprehensible than the former one—namely, that although there appeared no bar whatever to the introduction of another "personal

*friend*," another reformer of new-born pretensions, "it was *impossible* that the Major should be elected!"

But I must return to the recommendatory letter of the baronet to Mr. *Samuel Brooks*. On its contents being communicated to me by the committeemen, who had seen it, I felt that I had been very ill dealt with, and that it was, indeed "*impossible*" that a political connexion in the sacred cause of constitutional reform could any longer subsist between *one* who "*thought*" and acted as the baronet had done, and one who thought and acted as I thought and acted.

I therefore immediately wrote and dispatched my servant with a note, expressing my feelings as follows.—

"*To Sir Francis Burdett.*

"I find that, after sacrifices to public liberty which have not, in this age, been made by many; after a fidelity to the state, which had been surpassed by none,—and after vital services to the cause of parliamentary reform, which have been exceeded by few,—there are persons among whom I have acted, who oppose the confiding to me a trust, in the execution of which, there are those—and not a small number—who are persuaded, circumstanced as I have long been, and continue to be, I might be enabled to advance the cause in which I have long laboured, and with some credit, more than perhaps any other individual.

"I also learn that, for the trust in question, a preference by the opposing persons is now given to gentlemen, who, for years past, and years which our cause made years of trial—years in which the opposed person has done so much, these preferred gentlemen, whatever may be their patriotism, their talents, and their virtues, have done nothing.

"Seeing these things, I have nothing, thank God! to lament for myself, but much, as I conjecture, shall I have to lament for my country, in which such things are possible.

"JOHN CARTWRIGHT.

"June 2, 1818."

Considering the auspicious crisis to which the cause of constitutional reform was brought,—considering that to bring it to that crisis, had cost a *two-and-forty years' controversy*, and that in that controversy, from first to last, mine had not been the least prominent part,—considering the nature, the object, and the intimacy of the political intercourse between the baronet and myself,—and considering the honour which is ever supposed to govern men co-operating in so sacred a public cause,—considering, I say, all these, could less on the occasion under consideration, have been expected from *Sir Francis Burdett* to me—and, may I not add, to our country, for which I thought we were jointly labouring, than a manly frankness and an open dignified conduct?

And considering, moreover, that for the eight years during which I had been a citizen of *Westminster*, I had been second to no man in sustaining and elevating her reputation for services to reform and public freedom, I would ask why, if all the baronet had in view were fair and honourable, I was to be exclusively kept in the dark, until the plot for excluding me were fully ripened, and the name of one of the gentlemen he recommended was placarded for nomination and support in conjunction with his own, and as his "*personal friend*"—a gentleman who, although likewise a citizen of *Westminster*, had never once appeared when she had so distinguished herself as aforesaid by her services to reform and public freedom?

If a true interpretation of the former conduct, when the baronet "*THOUGHT*" the Major did not wish for a seat in "*Parliament*," were wanting, it is now supplied. We see the old reformer again pushed aside, to make way for that other gentleman of new-born pretensions, whose name stood last in the aforesaid letter of the baronet to Mr. *Samuel Brooks*.

In the apprehensions to be entertained from such facts, and from the mysterious conduct of the baronet for two years past, or more, as well as from his public speeches since the election, I may possibly be wrong; and no man more ar-



dently than myself wishes I may prove so.

Should there be any ready to suspect me of a deficiency in charity, let this sentiment be put in the scale against that notion of others, who, misinterpreting patience and forbearance, impute to me a facility of being too easily duped by professions. To the former class of persons, I say, in the words of the old Lord *Chatham*, "In an aged bosom confidence is a plant of slow growth." To both, I observe, that having long dealt in strict *demonstrations* as *standards* of right and wrong in political principle, I am not easily prejudiced either against an enemy, or for a friend.

After what I have already noticed respecting Sir *Francis Burdett*, and the doubts which his conduct has excited in the minds of myself and many others, it will be right that I should so far account for those doubts, as to show that I am not writing from spleen, but from a desire, on the one hand, to guard the public from a misplaced reliance on serious and unremitting exertions in the cause of reform, which may not take place, and, on the other hand, to furnish the baronet himself with a salutary warning of what may happen to his reputation, if he do not take care to prevent it.

Notwithstanding the declarations which have been made respecting *annual* Parliaments, *universal* freedom, and the *ballot*,—objects which are unquestionably necessary to be obtained for establishing our freedom—it is but too apparent, that it will be difficult to reconcile the late conduct of the baronet with any very rooted attachment to those objects: especially when the tenor of his public speeches shall be duly attended to.

The baronet's predilection for *annual* Parliaments is not, as we know, many years old; and moreover that it rests, not on the true sound foundation of inherent *demonstrated* right, which is indefeasible and *immutable*; but—on the unsound basis of history, of ancient statutes and the practice of our ancestors, all which are properly *changeable*, as our expedience may require. And it is not a little remarkable, as I shall presently

show, that for the *change* which did take place, by departing from annual Parliaments and for continuing in that departure, the baronet, in his last public speech, furnished the adversaries of our freedom with an argument which, fallacious as it is, they will quote as of great force; and which *their own ingenuity never before hit upon*.

Then, we are further to consider, that the baronet's belief in the doctrines of *universal* freedom and the *ballot*, had not a many months' possession of his mind prior to the *general election*. If, in the simplicity of my nature, I had indeed given him credit for a fruit-bearing sincerity, of attachment to the doctrines of our political salvation, and should in the end prove deceived, although it may show that I had not sufficiently profited by that scripture in which it is written, that seed sown on stony ground, for want of root soon withers away; yet if I be not wholly incorrigible in error, and if *experience* have not been quite thrown away upon me; now, that I am brought, by what has recently passed, to my recollection, and called on to put other good confiding Christians on their guard, I may possibly be of some use.

Allow me then to state, that in essentials towards reform, the late Duke of *Richmond* went considerably further than Sir *Francis Burdett* has yet gone. That very able and very energetic nobleman, who was a complete working man of business, not only tendered in Parliament an actual BILL for *universal* freedom and *annual* elections, but he likewise published that BILL to the world, as well as his famous letter to Colonel *Sharman*; unanswerably proving by close *logical* argument and *demonstration*, the truth of the principles on which that BILL was founded;—a mode of proceeding and of *pledging* the party, not hitherto adopted by the baronet.

With the facts before our eyes, of these proceedings of the Duke of *Richmond*, who, however, afterwards sat in the same cabinet with that political tiger, Mr. *Pitt*; would not *experience* be useless, might I not, without uncharitable imputations, be permitted to

warn the nation against believing the impossibility of the baronet himself becoming a changeling?

Here, if circumstances have taught me, that it is my duty to speak, I must nevertheless claim to stand in that respect perfectly apart from a powerful writer who has dealt largely in accusation of the baronet, for his want of sincerity as a constitutional reformer. The accusation of that writer must stand or fall, as supported, or contradicted, by facts and evidence.

It is not, however, to be supposed, but that while that powerful writer, as well as Lord *Cochrane* and myself, had free communication with the baronet, his lordship and myself, and perhaps others, heard from the complainant frequent observations to that effect. But in whatever degree I felt the force of his observations, I also felt a desire to be instrumental, if possible, towards the baronet's acting as the enlightened and virtuous expected from him, in the great cause of parliamentary reform.

I therefore continued a perfectly friendly *political* intercourse with the baronet, until a sense of what was due to personal honour compelled me, as hath been explained, to free him from a political connexion he seemed desirous of dissolving.

It will be recollected what extreme anxiety was felt by the radical reformers on the approach of the parliamentary session of 1817, when deputies from an immense number of petitioning communities assembled in London, in the ardent hope of a grand effort being made in Parliament, by means of a *bill*, which it is understood was to be brought in by Sir *Francis Burdett*.

The unparalleled distress of the nation, which distress was by that time universally seen to be a direct consequence of the House of Commons not representing the people, but having been metamorphosed into an engine of their oppression; had given rise to numerous petitions, in which it appeared that the effective power of the House of Commons was considered as concentrated in an *oligarchy*, whose barefaced usurpation and insufferable tyranny were up-

held by a corruption as notorious as it was infamous.

The suffering people, agonizing under their miseries, looked, as they had a right to look, for *such a bill*, and their eyes, as well as the eyes of all sincere reformers, were universally turned on Sir *Francis Burdett*. This was, of course, the case of Mr. *Cobbett*, who, in the meeting of deputies, had moved a resolution of high compliments and entire confidence in Sir *Francis Burdett*, although at that time the baronet did not approve of *universal freedom*, which was the unanimous sentiment and principle of those deputies. The resolution was not at first altogether acceptable, but it was so judiciously worded, and so ably supported by Mr. *Cobbett*, that, according to my recollection, it was voted unanimously. When the baronet failed, on the opening day of the session, distinctly to undertake the bringing in *a bill*, Mr. *Cobbett* was greatly irritated; as may be seen from the hasty note he wrote to me on the occasion, as follows:—

“ January 28. 1817.

“ MY DEAR SIR,

“ Sir *Francis* has anticipated Lord C.,  
“ and had given a notice RELATIVE  
“ TO ‘parliamentary reform!’ Lord  
“ C. has gone over\* to see the precise  
“ terms of the notice; but, at any rate,  
“ he is resolved not to be driven from  
“ the bill in the end.—Thus, you see,  
“ no good, and as much harm as he can,  
“ is at our service! “ W. C.”

Whether the irritation of Mr. *Cobbett* have, or have not, since hurried him sometimes beyond the just line of censure on a public character, I have no need to remark; but certain, however, it is, that in his *Registers* which have appeared subsequent to the 17. of November—the memorable nomination day for filling the *present* vacancy for *Westminster* (written of course long before—with uncommon force of language, Mr. *Cobbett* has told the public why, in his judgment, which events have shown to have been a prophetic kind of

\* His Lordship then lodged on the terrace, in Palace-yard, opposite the door of Westminster Hall.



judgment, it must be a prime object with the baronet, that I, of all men, should *not be placed in Parliament.*\*

Independent of any other person's opinion, it, however, belongs to me to show, that notwithstanding my willing co-operation with Sir *Francis*, subsequent to the time aforesaid, always in the hope, and always striving, that such co-operations should be serviceable to the cause of constitutional reform, on true legislative principles, according to the improved knowledge of the age, I was neither blind, nor accessory, to the baronet's omissions. In cabinet consultation with him, or with any man, I never concurred in projecting modes of reform, with which, in the forum, I could afterwards find fault.

Even after I was acquainted with the insult on my understanding, as well as on the common sense of all who knew how absorbed I was in an anxiety for the reform, in the pretence that it was "*thought I did not wish for a seat in Parliament;*" such was my repugnance to injure in any degree the cause of liberty, by *then* exposing that declaration, or publishing a written one of 2. of June, that I withheld all public mention of either; and likewise voted for the baronet's own election. Whether, in that, I did, or did not, according to my

intention, serve the cause of freedom, now depends on him for whom that vote was given.

But now, when the double-dealing of *June* has been proved by the double-dealing of *November*, longer silence would not only be personal meanness and insensibility, but a deficiency in public fidelity. In *June*, it was "*THOUGHT,*" forsooth! that an anxious and indefatigable reformer "*did not wish*" for an increase of means for promoting his object, "*ten-times tenfold!*"

In *November*, when that pretext could no longer serve, another was as readily coined; and a most extraordinary one it was. Sir *Francis Burdett*, as chairman of a meeting for the purpose of a nomination, formally declared, that "*he knew, indeed, of only one individual whose pretensions to the support of the meeting were paramount to those of Mr. Hobhouse, and that was his venerable friend, Major Cartwright.*" But he was thoroughly "*convinced that it would be impossible to INSURE the Major's election for Westminster.*"

When in *June*, the baronet opposed his "*venerable friend,*" by playing off against him one of his "*personal friends,*" how, I pray, was that *personal friend's* election "*INSURED.*"

Short, indeed, were his memory, did he not recollect the consternation caused by that experiment; which even for a while put in jeopardy his own return, and which placed him on the poll below his colleague! Was it not the shock given to public feeling on that occasion, which "*INSURED*" the "*personal friend's*" defeat?

With this recent experience of the fallibility of his own judgment, respecting the inclinations of the *Westminster electors at large*, what are we to think, when in the same breath, he proclaims the "*paramount pretensions*" of his "*venerable friend,*" gives it as his opinion that he cannot succeed,—and yet ventures on recommending another, and a still newer "*personal friend*" than the former, whose nomination proved so unfortunate, and with pretensions he thus acknowledges to be *inferior*?

Here, gentlemen, allow me to ask you a plain question.—Were we now going to another *general election*, and the baronet's *own return* not yet *INSURED*, would he, with a recollection of the *June* experiment on the patience of the electors, impressed on his mind, now venture on an exact counterpart of that presumptuous experiment; by starting a second "*personal friend,*" against one whose pretensions he himself tells you are "*paramount?*"

Surely, nothing but the circumstance of his own seat being now *safe*, could have inspired this aggravated insult, this repetition of an offence, before so deeply felt!

\* "*I saw*" what the baronet had done "*for the express purpose of keeping you out.*"—Dec. 5, p. 324.

"The baronet dreaded *you*, as an associate, above all men living," &c. p. 325.—"*And he resolved, that if he could avoid it, you should not be his companion.*"—p. 325.—"*He had, by the intrigues of his Rump, caused you to be kept out of Parliament.*"—Dec. 12. p. 358.

"It was this *division*, created solely by the baronet's dread of *you*, and, indeed, his hatred of your *teasing, baiting, gouding* on to action, that emboldened the Whigs to come forward." (a)—p. 359.

"They well know, that if the baronet had not set his *Rump* to intrigue for *Kinnaird*, you would have had no opposition."—p. 370.

"There is not a man in the kingdom, who does not clearly see, that *you have been excluded* by the *wishes* of the baronet."—p. 368.

(a) These words do not convey a correct idea of my conduct. Contenting myself with an inflexible adherence to self-evident and demonstrated principles, I ever left them to operate as they might; but never harassed the baronet with personal importunities.

How truly contemptible is crooked policy! The whole is of a piece. All littleness, darkness, and double-dealing! Can aught that is great, noble, generous, and truly devoted to the freedom of our unhappy country, spring from such a source? It may! For if we should hold our peace the very stones would immediately cry out.

I am not one of those readily-desponding mortals, who, when *divisions* occur,—for *divisions* must needs be, but woe unto them by whom they come,—fearfully infer that freedom will suffer. No. To its ultimate triumph, *divisions* are in truth as necessary as the fan or the thrashing floor, for dividing the chaff from the sound and solid grain!

What pitiful manœuvring! In *June* we have one manœuvre: in November another. In *June* the obstacle is a "*thought*:" in November it is a "*belief*."\* The election of the person of "*paramount pretensions*," it was *believed*, could not be *INSURED*!—Could not be *INSURED*. Good God! Was ever before such language addressed to a *public nomination meeting* of a few hundred inhabitants of a city containing *fourteen or fifteen thousand electors*—a city claiming a proud pre-eminence for patriotism and independence—and then having a representative to choose?

Was such a city, through such a meeting, ever before, in the same manner, at the same moment, and by the same orator, told of two persons, one of whom had for more than forty years steadily marched onward for the goal of reform, without having even once taken a suspicious step; and was moreover a well-known fellow-citizen;—the other, however amiable and promising, a youthful and new acquaintance, whose march was yet to begin, where such a conclusion was come to as that of the baronet?

What orator before ever so made his distinction between two competitors for confidence, in a trust of the highest importance to his auditors and the state; and in the same breath declared, that, although one of them had "*paramount pretensions*" to support, he recommended the other, and earnestly prayed their "*unanimity*" in his favour!!!

How luckless hath been that persevering reformer's "*wish*" for better means of promoting his object! Most unfortunately, that "*wish*" happened to be *unknown* to a brother reformer who had the *best means of knowing it*,—to one, who must have "*thought*" his *venerable friend* with *paramount pretensions* to a seat in Parliament, the essence of inconsistency, not to have entertained that "*wish*."

But, as ill-luck would have it, in summer that "*wish*" becomes the victim of a "*THOUGHT*;" in autumn, when the *thought* has passed away, the throat of the "*wish*" is cut by a "*BELIEF*;" and such a

**BELIEF!** Does not this talking about *believing* and *wishing*, bring to mind the old adage on the proneness of men to *believe* as they themselves wish?

But no matter! At all events we can, at the worst, divert ourselves with the tricks played before us. If we cannot turn them to use, they may serve us for sport. But it is the proper end of farce to treat us with a laugh at folly, and the exposure of double-dealing, while it leaves behind a little moral instruction. And have we not been feasted in both ways, and with that benefit?

When, last summer, it was intended to deck untried inexperienced *youth*, in the spoils of long-tryed fidelity, the veteran reformer was discovered to have the crime of being "*OLD*;" this winter, when *versatility* is thought to be coming into fashion, he is, it seems, accused of the sin of "*INFLEXIBILITY*!"†—inflexible, indeed, would be his risible muscles, were they not moved by such exhibition of the tricksters!

To conclude: I have now performed a task not at all to my taste. I should infinitely have preferred a continuance of a friendly political connexion, long maintained, and, on my part, with the utmost fidelity, to what has taken place; for that connexion in its latter period, afforded me a pleasing prospect of being shortly placed in a situation to have given me, for promoting the cause of radical reform, for the salvation of our country, ten times ten-fold means.

But that connexion having, by the other party to it, been put an end to, I have thought it right to submit to you, who have a great interest in knowing the truth, the foregoing facts and reasonings.

To you it must be left to judge, how far Mr. *Cobbett*, in his writing, prior to a possibility of his having any knowledge of the *second act*, in the Westminster election drama of 1818, was justified in his opinion respecting the *motives of Sir Francis Burdett's* conduct towards myself; and how far that deep-sighted person has shown himself a prophet, with regard to the close of the baronet's political career.

It will, however, be allowed, that I have not kept a malicious silence, indulging a secret wish, that Mr. *Cobbett's* prophecies may come to pass, for exposing and disgracing one by whom I feel myself to have been ill-treated; but that I have bestowed on the party as wholesome a warning, and as sound advice, for the public good, and his own reputation, as could have been given him by his best "*personal friend*," under a sense of the highest obligation received at his hands.

JOHN CARTWRIGHT.

† So he was informed by a correspondent who heard the accusation.

\* The word reported is "*convinced*." But whatever strength this might be intended to give to the expression, it was not possible to be more than *belief*.



## THE LOWEST THING THAT THIS WORLD EVER HEARD OF.

THE poet talks of a "*lower deep in the lowest deep.*" Here we have it. The *Whig* faction was in the "lowest deep" before it took in HOBHOUSE and sent him to move a flogging bill, and when it got the support of the shuffling BURDETT. But, if the following report, which I take from the *Morning Chronicle*, be true, it has found a "*lower deep in the lowest deep.*" BURDETT and HOBHOUSE having been hooted off from their own dunghill at the Crown and Anchor; *having been afraid to attend at a general meeting of the candidates to be pledged to the repeal of the house and window-tax; and having been most famously assaulted for their non-attendance, fell upon the following scheme, in order, if possible, to be able to dupe the electors of WESTMINSTER once more.* They got a parcel of their own stupid partisans, living in the parish of St. JAMES, to solicit an interview with Lord ALTHORP upon the house and window-tax. The "noble" Lord gave his consent to the meeting! And, curious to relate, the COUPLE of famous baronets went up before "*my Lord*" with the deputation, to urge the necessity of taking off these taxes, and thereby to *obtain a claim for being re-elected and trusted!* But, for God's sake, read the report; and then hear me again.

### VISIT OF THE DEPUTATION FROM THE PARISHES OF WESTMINSTER TO LORD ALTHORP, UPON THE SUBJECT OF THE ASSESSED TAXES.

Last night, at a little before nine o'clock, a meeting of the rate-payers of St. James's, Westminster, assembled at the Saddler's Arms Tavern, in the Quadrant, for the purpose of transacting some routine business, but chiefly to receive, from the delegates of that parish, a report of the result of the interview which the deputation, appointed on Tuesday night to wait upon Lord Althorp, had yesterday with that nobleman.

Mr. BAWDEN was called to the chair.

Mr. BOWEN, one of the deputation, stated to the meeting, that nearly twenty gentlemen waited upon Lord Althorp that morning, at his office in Downing-street, and were met there by the representatives of Westminster, Sir F. Burdett and Sir John Cam Hobhouse. The

deputation was received with *very great courtesy* by his Lordship, and Mr. A'Beckett, of Golden-square, commenced by stating the necessity that existed at the present moment for the Government to take the subject of the *abolition of the assessed taxes* into its most serious consideration. Lord Althorp said the subject should most assuredly have his *serious attention*, and would unquestionably be a matter for *grave deliberation with the whole of his Majesty's Government*. There were, however, so many taxes of which the public were demanding the immediate remission—for instance, the taxes on knowledge—that it was impossible to say to what extent the Government would be prepared to go in the abolition of the house and window-tax, of which the deputation complained. Mr. Wyld (of St. Martin's parish) then read to his Lordship the resolutions which were passed at the meeting of the delegates at the Quadrant Hotel, on Tuesday evening, the sentiments contained in which appeared to make *considerable impression* upon the noble Lord. Mr. Wyld added, that it was the firm impression of a great majority of that class of the inhabitants of Westminster, whose opinions were generally considered of weight in public questions, that the assessed taxes should, and indeed *must be abolished*. Sir J. C. Hobhouse (Mr. Bowen continued) then addressed Lord Althorp, and used, in *strong terms*, every argument that could be urged in *favour of the abolition of the house and window-tax*; and not only enlarged upon the *necessity*, but expressed his firm conviction that it *must be taken off*. He reminded the noble Lord that he (Sir J. C. Hobhouse) had twice made a motion in the House of Commons in furtherance of the wishes now so loudly and universally expressed by the people, upon the subject of these taxes; and on each of those occasions he had been honoured by the support of his Lordship's vote. (Cheers from the meeting.) Lord Althorp SMILED, and said he believed the right hon. Baronet was quite right. He certainly had given those motions his support. Sir J. C. Hobhouse then again urged the *subject upon the attention of the Chancellor of this Exchequer*, observing that he had a double claim to his support at this juncture, and concluded by giving it as his opinion that an equalization would not satisfy the public; but that there must be a *total remission of the house and window-tax*. (Hear, hear, and loud cheering from the meeting.) Mr. Bowen went on to inform the meeting that Mr. Brown, of St. James's, next proceeded to address Lord Althorp, and declared it as his firm belief, founded upon extensive means of knowledge, that nothing but the total repeal of this tax would satisfy the country; and that whether the Ministers thought proper or not to propose to a *reformed House of Commons* would *compel them to abolish it*. There was, in fact, no question upon which the people were more determined. His Lordship would recollect,

that previous to the passing of the Reform Bill, placards were stuck up in the windows of most of the houses in Westminster, stating the determination of the inhabitants *to pay no taxes until that measure became a law*; which demonstration of feeling had a great effect in assisting the bill in its progress; and he (Mr. Brown) was sure, that the *same expression of feeling would appear again*, if any reluctance were shown to bring about the remission of this odious tax. Sir Francis Burdett also spoke on the subject, and repeated his former expressed opinion, that the house and window-tax was grievous and *abominable*, and *must be repealed*. (Hear, hear, from the meeting.) Lord Althorp said, that with all his willingness to relieve the people, he would ask, if he remitted a certain portion of the taxes upon a sudden demand, whether he must not put on *some new tax* to meet the exigencies of the country? To this Sir F. Burdett replied, "*No, you must retrench: that is the only means of saving the country.*" (Cheers from the meeting.) The interview here terminated; and the general impression amongst the deputation was, that Lord Althorp seemed to think the subject must at an early period be taken into earnest consideration. The report of the deputation was received with much applause, and the meeting separated.

Reader, how often have I said, "As the end approacheth, there will be everlasting choppings and changings in the Ministry: the fellows that carry on the concern, will get to be lower and lower, in character as well as in talent, till at last it will become so very low a thing, that no man will have anything to do with it, unless he be in *absolute want of the necessaries of life.*" Well! Is it far from this now? Here is a parish deputation, that takes hold of one Minister, and drags him up before another, and makes him tell that other that he must take off the taxes; and here is that other Minister, flatly told by the deputies of a parish, that they will *refuse to pay taxes*, unless these particular taxes were taken off; and here is this threatened Minister promising, that "his Majesty's Government" will take the matter into their *grave* consideration. And then, away go the parish deputies to their electioneering meeting, and relate what was past, and hold it forth as a reason for the people's re-electing BURDETT and HOBHOUSE. This is something quite new. Something that we have never heard of before; but, though

that would seem impossible, we shall see things a great deal lower than this before the end comes. The struggle will now never be given up till we have **CHEAP GOVERNMENT**: both the factions will strive against this as long as they can, because they cannot wallow in taxes and tithes, and we have *cheap Government* at the same time. If the two factions were *wise*, they would yield, at once; and then, the frame of the Government, and all private property, would be safe. But the danger is, that they will not yield at once; but, on the contrary, puffed up with habitual insolence, and surrounded with power, which they look upon as invulnerable and immortal, will defend taxes and the tithes, inch by inch. And, if they do this, I now warn them that their peril is extreme, and that they will bring upon themselves, and upon the frame of the Government along with them, *that which I do not care fully to describe*. I would fain hope that they would take this warning into their serious thoughts; if they do not, let them bear in mind, and let my readers bear in mind, that the fault is not mine; and that I have done all that I can do to prevent so terrible a catastrophe. I am for destroying none of the ancient and good institutions of the country. Very few of them remain: I am for restoring such as have been destroyed or impaired. But, I am for **CHEAP GOVERNMENT**; and to obtain **CHEAP GOVERNMENT** shall be the incessant object of my efforts.

### ALDERMAN SCALES.

The following letter was sent by Alderman Scales to the editor of the *Times*, who declined publishing it.

"44, Aldgate, 30. Nov. 1832.

"SIR,—Either from ignorance or a desire to misrepresent, you state that I, Mr. Pearson, and Mr. Wakley, got up the meeting of yesterday. As far as I am concerned, your statement is untrue; nor do I to this moment know who did get it up, except that that highly public-spirited man Mr. Nicholson of Fenchurch-

here some April, in great part of my life, I know nothing—I was informed that and I believe that the meeting of which I do not is the least mean trade, who at the time of the meeting, but I do not to address you is



street was the principal promoter of it—I very much regret I cannot share that honour with him.

“You are under another mistake in supposing I had read the *Times*, since you traduced me by publishing ex-parte falsehoods against me, and refused to publish my letter in refutation of them, because I threatened to horsewhip you, as all concealed assassins of a man’s private character ought to be treated.

“I repeat, you are under mistake in supposing I ever read your Paper. I treat your Paper as Jude Turton treated Nan Swindell, a notorious impure, at Chesterfield, in Derbyshire. ‘Nan’ said Jude, ‘where wilt thou be at nine o’clock to-night?’ She replied, ‘Either at the bottom of the Market-place, or at Pin-alley Corner.’ ‘O!’ said Jude, ‘because where thou art there I will not be.’ And as I consider your paper far more poisonous to society than a thousand Nan Swindells ever were, where your paper is there I will not be.

“You must be taught to treat the public with respect, and not to brand them, even before you have seen them, with every species of low abuse, or the ‘first journal in Europe’ will soon be known as the worst journal in Europe.

“I am, Mr. Editor,

“Yours very sincerely,

“MICHAEL SCALES.”

“To the Editor of the *Times*.”

*From the LONDON GAZETTE,*

FRIDAY, NOV. 23, 1832.

#### INSOLVENT.

FULLER, W., Southover, Sussex, tanner.

#### BANKRUPTS.

ANDERSON, J., and J. Perry, Worcester, painters.

BILL, J., Broseley, Shropshire, butcher.

BRASS, P. W., King-st., Hammersmith, oilman.

BURTON, R., Berkeley-place, Clifton, Gloucestershire, victualler.

CARTER, H. C., Tooting, Surrey, linen-draper.

COCKIN, R., Doncaster, Yorkshire, maltster.

CREWE, S. and E., Burslem, Staffordshire, innkeepers.

DEAN, J., Liverpool, tailor.

DRUCKER, S., Old City-chambers, Bishopsgate-street Within, merchant.

ESCUPIER, J., Albemarle-street, Piccadilly, hotel-keeper.

GEARY, N., New Bond-st., stay-manufacturer.

GRAHAM, W., Rosemary-lane, Whitechapel, victualler.

HAXBY, W., Hunmanby, Yorkshire, lace-manufacturer.

HAYLES, C., Portsmouth, grocer.

PANSON, T. G., Aldgate, woollen-draper.

LEWELLYN, W., Argoed-mills, Moneythus-lovne, Monmouthshire, miller.

PINWILL, W. T., and J. H. Pleasce, Exeter.

SHAW, J., Great St. Helen’s, general dealer.

SHEPHERD, H. J., Beverley, Yorkshire, dealer.

SNUGGS, C., Mint-st., Boro’, cabinet-maker.

THOMAS, W., T., and L., Narrow-street, ship-owners.

TOBIN, E., Rathbone-place, dealer.

WHEELDON, R., Birmingham, victualler.

WILLIAMS, J., Fleet-street, stationer.

TUESDAY, DEC. 4, 1832.

#### BANKRUPTCY SUPERSEDED.

MAUD, W. and R., Andover, common brewers.

#### BANKRUPTS.

BUTLER, W., Little St. Thomas Apostle, painter.

COLES, W. jun., Mincing-lane, broker.

DAUBNEY, T., Portsea, Hampshire, grocer.

FENTON, W., Woodhouse, Leeds, farmer.

GOUDE, H., Leicester, and Harper-street, Red Lion-square, seedsman.

GREEN, R., Bristol, hosier.

HENSMAN, B., Queen-street-place, money-scrivener.

HENWOOD, N., Penzance, Cornwall, victualler.

KETTLE, J. O., Southampton-street, Strand, tailor.

LEAR, F., Kingswood-hill, Bitton, Gloucestershire, tallow-chandler.

PEAKE, T., Shrewsbury, grocer.

PINNEY, B., Stafford-place, Pimlico, picture-dealer.

REDGRAVE, W., Grosvenor-street West, Pimlico, wire-worker.

SHAW, B., Rochdale, Lancashire, hat-manuf.

SIMS, W., St. Ives, and Penzance, Cornwall, grocer.

SPARKOW, H., Wolverhampton, iron-founder.

TUNNICLIFF, T., Sileby, Leicestershire, lace-manufacturer.

WHITBURN, R., Esher, brewer.

#### LONDON MARKETS.

MARK-LANE, CORN-EXCHANGE, Dec. 3.—There was a good supply of wheat to-day from Kent and Essex, but scarcely any from the Suffolk coast. Early in the morning a few of the first runs were taken off by the millers at an advance of 2s. per qr. above the quotations of this day se’night, in expectation of orders for purchasing for Yorkshire when the post came in, but as no demand of that kind took place, the trade became exceedingly heavy,

nor could any further progress be made in sale at any improvement on the terms of last Monday, except for a few superfine picked samples, which sold 1s. per qr. higher. Free foreign wheat is 1s. per qr. dearer, but did not go off freely at that advance. This check in the wheat trade has had its influence on the price of flour, which was expected to have been established at the contemplated advance of 5s. per sack, but it still remains an unsettled point, and the only improvement as yet realised is 2s. per sack, making 50s. the selling, instead of the nominal price.

Barley was heavy sale, at a decline of 1s. per qr. on the finest malting, and from 1s. to 2s. on the stained and inferior descriptions, although the supply was small.

White peas were in demand and 1s. per qr. higher.

Oats fully supported the quotations of last week, but were not free sale.

In beans, grey peas, and other articles, there is no alteration.

Wheat .....	62s. to 64s.
Rye .....	32s. to 33s.
Barley .....	27s. to 29s.
— fine .....	36s. to 38s.
Peas, White .....	38s. to 40s.
— Boilers .....	43s. to 45s.
— Grey .....	36s. to 38s.
Beans, Small .....	35s. to 40s.
— Tick .....	33s. to 35s.
Oats, Potato .....	20s. to 24s.
— Feed .....	18s. to 21s.
Flour, per sack .....	50s. to 55s.

#### PROVISIONS.

Bacon, Middles, new, 45s. to 48s. per cwt.	
— Sides, new ...	50s. to 53s.
Pork, India, new ...	127s. 0d. to —s.
— Mess, new ...	77s. 0d. to —s. per barl.
Butter, Belfast ...	84s. to 86s. per cwt.
— Carlow ...	86s. to 92s.
— Cork ...	82s. to 84s.
— Limerick ...	82s. to 84s.
— Waterford ...	78s. to 84s.
— Dublin ...	78s. to 80s.
Cheese, Cheshire ...	54s. to 90s.
— Gloucester, Double ...	50s. to 60s.
— Gloucester, Single ...	44s. to 50s.
— Edam ...	48s. to 50s.
— Gouda ...	48s. to 50s.
Hams, Irish ...	55s. to 66s.

#### SMITHFIELD.—Dec. 3.

This day's supply of beasts was great; but with the exception of its embracing a greater number of good Herefords than we have seen here since April, in great part of middling and inferior quality: of sheep and calves moderately good: of porkers but limited. The trade, with even the primest description of

meat, was by no means brisk; but with each kind of middling and inferior quality very dull, at but little, if any, variation from Friday's prices.

Full three-fifths of the beasts were about equal numbers of short-horns, Irish and Devonshire (principally) steers and heifers, and Welch (for the most part North Wales) runts, principally from Lincolnshire, Leicestershire, Northamptonshire, and Huntingdonshire: the remaining two-fifths about equal numbers of Hereford, Staffordshire, and Wiltshire oxen, steers, and heifers, with some cows, small Scots, chiefly from our western and midland districts, and Town's-end cows; with a few Sussex beasts, &c.

At least three-fifths of the sheep were new Leicesters, of the South Down and white-faced cross; about a fifth South Downs; and the remaining fifth about equal numbers of Kents and Kentish half-breds, and old Leicesters; with a few Herefords, polled and horned Norfolks, horned and polled Scotch and Welch sheep, horned Dorsets, &c.

Beasts, 3,252; sheep, 18,650; calves, 132; pigs, 230.

#### MARK-LANE.—Friday, Dec. 7.

The arrivals this week are short for the season of the year; but the market is dull, and prices rather lower.

#### THE FUNDS.

3 per Cent.	}	Fri.	Sat.	Mon.	Tues.	Wed.	Thur.
Cons. Ann.		—	83½	83½	83½	83½	—

#### TO THE ELECTORS OF LAMBETH.

**G**ENTLEMEN,—I attended at the Meeting at the Horns last Thursday evening, for the purpose of laying my sentiments before it as a householder in Lambeth, who is regularly rated in the books at 35l. a year, who has paid all his taxes up to April last, and holds the receipts, and who, not having found any of the candidates that have started for the representation of this borough to his mind, has promised his vote to none.

But, gentlemen, as I do not belong to any Political Union, and as I could not own myself a friend of Mr. Wakefield—a gentleman of whom I know nothing—I was informed that my sentiments would not be heard at that meeting, of which I do not in the least mean to complain, but proceed to address you in



print, as well as my brother reformers all over the kingdom—a right which, I presume, no man can deny me, nor take offence at.

Gentlemen, I consider our country in such a state of distress and peril, that it is our bounden duty at this momentous period to look out for the wisest heads and the honestest hearts, to save us from confusion and ruin.

I am not given to form my judgment of men from what they may say to us now; I like to look back, and see what a man has said or done before he had any thought of obtaining our votes, and before reform came into fashion.

Gentlemen, I will tell you candidly why I do not approve of any of the candidates that have hitherto offered themselves.

In the first place, I am a little suspicious of any man that offers himself for such a post. I think it entirely an affair of the electors, and not of the elected. I consider Lord Palmerston is out of the question. I would not vote for Mr. Hawes, because, to my knowledge, he has, upon more occasions than one, availed himself of the odious provisions of Sturges Bourne's bill to overpower the rate-payers of his parish, and therefore I think little of his present professions. I am in great doubts about Mr. Tennyson; because, when he sat as the representative of his nephew's rotten borough of Bletchingley, he not only did not vote for the resolution moved by the Marquis of Blandford on the 24. June, 1829—"That there exists a class of boroughs, commonly called close or decayed, in which the returns of members to Parliament are notoriously capable of being effected by the payment of money in the way of purchase, and frequently are so effected; and also another class of boroughs, in which the elective franchise is vested in so few electors, that the returns are capable of being effected by the payment of money in the way of bribes to individual electors, and frequently are so effected;" but Mr. Tennyson did everything in his power to swell the majority of 114 to 40, upon the motion of Mr. Secretary Peel, that "no such boroughs existed;" and Mr. Tennyson voted in that majority, as may be seen in the *Mirror of Parliament*; therefore I fear he is but what may be called a humbug reformer.

With respect to Mr. Moore I do not know enough of his pretensions to think that he is the properest man for us to select in these eventful times. I have also heard what I do not like about the expenses entailed on our parish when he was chairman of the Church Building Committee.

Now I will tell you of a man for whom I and thousands of my brother reformers, either in Lambeth or in any other part of the country, may be proud not only to give him our votes, but to subscribe any five, or ten, or twenty shillings a year to pay him the wages of attendance, according to the good old law, and according to the value of money at the present day, and without which, it is my opinion, that we shall never have a man we can truly

call our own; nor will such reforms as all our institutions require, without destroying any of them, be safely and effectually accomplished by the House of Commons. The gentleman I mean to recommend, is a reformer of forty years standing, who took an active part in that great question in his early days, and has done the same of late.

This gentleman was the framer of that famous and invaluable Bill of Reform presented to the House of Commons in November, 1829, by his friend, the Marquis of Blandford, who in my opinion did himself immortal honour by consulting, and taking the advice of such a learned, experienced, and uncompromising reformer. It does not take one particle from the merit of the noble Marquis, but, in my eyes, greatly increases it; for he is a man possessed of the highest talents, and must have well considered all the great provisions of his bill, before he brought it forward, and it is as much his act and deed as any he ever signed. Now, gentlemen, I will tell you in the words of the Political Council of the town of Birmingham, what this famous bill did for the people, and then you may contrast it with the bill of the Ministers.

"And this council considering further, that the Marquis of Blandford's bill does in fact restore to the people all those great constitutional rights, privileges, and protections, which their forefathers possessed, but of which they have themselves been wrongfully deprived, and more especially that it

"1st. Dismisses all placemen from the House of Commons, agreeably to the great constitutional act of settlement, which placed the present family on the throne.

"2d. That it repeals the Septennial Act, and gives back to the people their ancient and undeniable right to triennial or more frequent Parliaments, recognised and secured by the great constitutional act, the 6th of William and Mary, cap. 2.

"3d. That it abolishes the qualification of property, as fixed unconstitutionally by the act of the 9th of Queen Anne, cap. 5., and restores the ancient undeniable right of sitting and voting as a citizen or burgess in the Commons House of Parliament to every individual among the common people, who may be lawfully chosen a member of that body.

"4thly. That agreeably to the ancient and undeniable laws of the land, it renders it imperative on the citizens and burgesses of the House of Commons to be in general real citizens and burgesses, resident within the places they represent, and consequently acquainted and identified with their wants, feelings, and interests.

"5thly. That it secures the fidelity of such citizens and burgesses, by putting in force the ancient constitutional law, which provides that all of them shall receive a certain, known, definite, and reasonable payment from their constituents for good purposes, instead of an uncertain, unknown, and enormous payment for bad purposes, from the Government.

"6thly. That it makes effectual provision for breaking up the rotten boroughs, and transferring the elective franchise to the great towns and districts now unrepresented, or inefficiently represented.

"7thly. That it makes provision for greatly diminishing the enormous expenses with which elections of members of Parliament are now generally attended.

"8thly. That it makes provisions for securing the elective franchise to every householder in the United Kingdom," the only condition being that he be assessed to any tax, and willing to be assessed to the wages of attendance, and then he might vote at the place nearest to his residence.

The Council not only unanimously pledged themselves to this bill, but an immense meeting of their townsmen did the same, and afterwards signed and presented their "petition of right" to the House of Commons, in which they insisted upon all these provisions, and demanded them accordingly.

Why the Council should have thrown this bill overboard, and have adopted the Ministerial Bill through thick and thin, and actually carried it, when they might have as easily carried their own bill; and why they should have thus set the example to their townsmen of their departing from their ledges to this bill, as they have lately done under the new union they have framed, I cannot tell. Sure I am they have thereby lost the weight with the public they once possessed, and have deterred me, for one, from ever joining any Political Union.

Who the gentleman is that I thus recommend, and what are the many other things he has done to entitle him to the gratitude and confidence of his countrymen, may be the subject of a future communication.

My opinion is, that the mantle of immortality for a good Reform Bill, such as shall satisfy the country and save us from all the horrors of a convulsion has yet to descend upon the shoulders of him who deserves to wear it, and that the present bill must be amended by the adoption of all the great provisions, honesty and simplicity of Lord Blandford's Bill; and who so proper to effect this object as the man who drew it, and he who brought it before Parliament? I have no desire to put myself forward in this affair, and would rather see it taken up by more able and influential men; but I have left my address with the editor of this paper, and I refer to my advertisement in the same.

G. R.

Lambeth, November 10. 1832.

P.S. Those who agree with me that the learned Gentleman above spoken of is a proper person to be put in nomination for our borough may send me a line to that effect, addressed G. R., at the Horns, and I will wait upon them when and where they may appoint, to concert such measures as we may think proper.

41, LONG ACRE.

## MATHEWS'S CHEAP CANDLE MANUFACTORY.

CANDLES.		s. d.
Finest Wax Candles, per lb. ....	1	9
Palace Wax ditto .....	1	8
Wax Pieces ditto .....	1	6
Sperm or Composition, plaited wicks ..	1	5
Old Store Moulds, with wax wicks ....	0	7
Best Store dips ditto .....	0	6

SOAPS.		s. d.
Old Brown Windsor, per lb. ....	1	4
White and Palm ditto .....	1	0
Mottled, per 112 lbs. ....	70	0
Best Pale Yellow .....	64	0
Good ditto .....	60	0

OILS.		s. d.
Genuine Sperm Oil, imperial gallon ..	6	0
Best Pale Seal .....	3	6
Common Lamp .....	3	0

Starch, Blue, &c. &c.

Finest Sealing Wax, 4s. per lb.

J. M. begs to state that there are no two-priced articles kept or sold at his shop. The above are warranted first quality and for Cash only. Delivered in town, and carefully packed for the country.

## CHEAP CLOTHING!!

SWAIN AND CO., Tailors, &c.,

93, FLEET-STREET,

(Near the new opening to St. Bride's Church.)

BEG to present to the notice of the Public the List of Prices which they charge for Gentlemen's Clothing.

### FOR CASH ONLY.

	£	s.	d.
A Suit of Superfine Clothes .....	4	14	6
Ditto, Black or Blue .....	5	5	0
Ditto, Best Saxony .....	5	15	6
Plain Silk Waistcoats .....		16	0
Figured ditto ditto .....		18	0
Valencia ditto .....		12	0
Barogan Shooting Jackets .....	1	8	0
A Plain Suit of Livery .....	4	4	0

LADIES' HABITS AND PELISSES, and CHILDREN'S DRESSES, equally cheap; in the manufacture of which they are not surpassed at the West-end of the Town.

I recommend Messrs. Swain and Co. as very good and punctual tradesmen, whom I have long employed with great satisfaction. WM. COBBETT.

Printed by William Cobbett, Johnson's-court: and published by him, at 11, Bolt-court, Fleet-street.